DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 911 VT 017 744

TITLE A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs (A Study of Selected NYC-1 Projects).
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Social Research Group.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 71
NOTE 604p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$23.03
DESCRIPTORS Culturally Disadvantaged; Disadvantaged Youth; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Programs; Job Development; Job Placement; Job Skills; *Job Training; *Manpower Development; *Out of School Youth; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Neighborhood Youth Corps; NYC

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of a Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) prospective study, which are based on program-sourced information and second-round followup interviews with study subjects. The primary hypothesis that the NYC programs studied had helped enrollees achieve satisfactory adjustment to life and to the world of work was not confirmed, and an early conclusion that the NYC seemed to be most effective with Negro women was not supported by later data. Although there was no clear evidence that the NYC effectively enhanced the employability of the average enrollee, there was evidence that some program components were having a significant effect. Formal skill training, work sites with training and employment opportunities, job development, and job placement assistance appeared to be associated with increased post-NYC employment. Some other major findings were: (1) The NYC is reaching seriously disadvantaged youth with major employability problems, (2) Enrollees, on the whole, gave a good report of the usefulness of the NYC program and the helpfulness of work supervisors and counselors, and (3) The attitudes of enrollees are associated with their employability. These and other findings and implications are provided in this report. (SB)

ED 069911

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS

(A Study of Selected NYC-1 Projects)

April, 1971

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development Contract No. 41-7-004-09 authorized by the Economic Development Act. Since contractors performing such work under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, the report does not necessarily represent the Department's official opinion or policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in the report.

VT017744

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Regis H. Walther, Project Director
Margaret L. Magnusson, Research Associate
Shirley E. Cherkasky, Research Associate

Contract No. 41-7-004-09
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Portions of this study of Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school programs in selected cities have been reported in earlier publications and credit was given to persons who helped in a significant way to complete the earlier parts of the research. We want to thank these individuals again and to express our special appreciation to the following persons who have helped us with more than one phase of the study.

First , we want to thank the staff of the Manpower Administration without whose help the study could not have been completed. In particular , we want to thank Joel Barries, William Paschell, Thomas Joyce, Harry Lieberman, Jesse Davis, and Richard Fogarty.

The following staff members of the NYC sponsors gave essential backing to and cooperation with the research: Harry Martin, Nathaniel James, Henry Christmon, Lawrence Turner, and R'Lester Killens in Cincinnati; William Purcell and Irwin Holmes in Durham; Commadore Jones, Abb Vaughn, and Daniel Williams in St. Louis; Jack White and Walter Robinson in East St. Louis; and Marion Finkelhor and Paul Jones in Pittsburgh.

Field supervisors provided indispensable help in the four cities in which we conducted interviewing. These were Murray Weisman and Helen Shannon in Cincinnati; Robert Miriani and Mary Canada in St. Louis; Stanley Campbell and Dewitt Weary in East St. Louis; and Albert Capehart in Durham.

On our own staff, Miss Maggie Carter supervised the coding, Mrs. Emily O'Neill prepared computer programs and processed the data; and Miss Susan Stinson, aided by Mrs. Susan Charlton, Mrs. Susan Lee Mrs. Marianna Diggs, and Miss Rosa Harris, provided essential administrative assistance.

Finally, we want to thank all of the interviewers and the youth themselves who participated in the study.

Summary

Since its inception in 1965, the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) has been the largest Federal Manpower Program for disadvantaged youth. This is the final report of a study, begun in 1966, of selected urban out-of-school NYC programs. Undertaken to study the extent to which these selected NYC programs enhanced the employability of enrollees and the elements of effective program operations, this study consisted of the following research units:

The Retrospective study was undertaken to provide usable information in the shortest possible time. Experimental study groups (composed of enrollees) and Control study groups (composed of individuals matched to those in Experimental groups except for the fact of NYC experience) were constituted in Cincinnati, Durham, East St. Louis, and St. Louis. Subjects in the Experimental groups were selected from enrollees in the program in 1965-66. Experimental and Control group subjects were interviewed during the winter and spring of 1967, and for a second time in the summer of 1968.

The Prospective study was designed to get program information during the time of NYC enrollments as well as information concerning program sequels. Experimental study groups were constituted from entering enrollees in the above four sites; and information concerning the NYC experience of these subjects was collected during the course of their NYC enrollment. Subjects in the Experimental groups only were interviewed in the summer of 1968. Subjects in both Experimental and Control groups in three sites[1] were interviewed during the summer of 1969.

The Termination study of enrollees terminating from two Pittsburgh and the Cincinnati programs in the last half of 1966 followed-up on enrollees through mailed self-report questionnaires.

---

[1] East St. Louis was eliminated because of high cost and low completion rates.

The Clerical Co-Op study of a formal skill-training program designed to achieve entry-level employability for enrollees interested in clerical work by alternating classroom work with on-the-job training. A study group of enrollees who entered the program in 1966 was followed through the program. Follow-up information was secured from study subjects and their employers in the summer of 1968.

The Accelerated Learning Experiment (ALE) provided for the experimental use and evaluation of the system of programmed instruction and materials developed for the Job Corps Conservation Centers. This experiment involved three sites--Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis--and was run in two periods (the first, of six months; and the second, of nine months). The ALE concluded with a three-day work shop in Washington.

The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes study developed an inventory that is currently being tested. A series of investigations involved the administration of an initial and a revised inventory to three out-of-school groups (NYC, New Careers, and delinquent) and four in-school groups (NYC, and students in a suburban high school, an inner-city high school, and a vocational urban high school).

With the exception of the Prospective study, the results of these research units have been reported previously. This paper reports Prospective study results based on program-sourced information and second-round follow-up interviews with study subjects. The conclusions and implications developed in this paper are based on the results of all of the research undertaken in connection with this study.

The primary hypothesis of this research--that the NYC programs studied had helped enrollees achieve satisfactory adjustment to life and to the world of work--was not confirmed. An early conclusion that the NYC seemed to be most effective with Negro women was not supported by later data. First-round interviewing in the Retrospective study showed that female, but not male, subjects in the Experimental group had significantly less unemployment than comparable subjects in the Control group. In the second round of interviewing, however, no significant differences in unemployment were found for either male or female subjects. In the Retrospective, but not in the Prospective, study, both male and female subjects in the Experimental group were found to be more self-supporting than comparable subjects in the Control group. Although there was no clear evidence that the NYC effectively enhanced the employability of the average enrollee, there was evidence that some program components were having a significant effect. Formal skill training, work sites with training and employment opportunities, job development, and job placement assistance appeared to be associated with increased post-NYC employment.

Other major findings were:

--The NYC is reaching seriously disadvantaged youth with major employability problems;

--Enrollees, on the whole, gave a good report of the usefulness of the NYC program and the helpfulness of work supervisors and counselors;

--Negro females were by far the biggest group of enrollees and stayed in the NYC longer than other subjects. Negro males were the next biggest study group;

--White youth who enrolled in the studied programs were more disadvantaged than Negro enrollees in that the white youth averaged a year less school completed and were given a lower rating by intake interviewers;

--Male enrollees averaged less schooling and were more apt to have left school for academic or disciplinary reasons;

--Male enrollees were assigned most frequently to cleaning, maintenance, and unskilled labor positions.

--Female enrollees were assigned most frequently to clerical and professional aide positions;

--Subjects in both Experimental and Control groups were experiencing extensive maladjustment to life and the world of work. At the time of interview, the activities of upwards of 42 percent of the male subjects and 50 percent of the female subjects indicated that they were out of the mainstream of productive activity;

--The attitudes of enrollees are associated with their employability. In the study of work-relevant attitudes, it was found that attitude questions differentiated on the basis of sex, race, and school status with the largest proportion of the variance associated with school status. A factor analysis suggested that three underlying dimensions are Optimism, Self-Confidence, and Unsocialized Attitudes.

The results of this research have direct implications for improved NYC operations. These implications were discussed in the form of the following seven propositions:

1. The employability of enrollees is enhanced primarily through vocationally-relevant NYC experience.

Post-NYC employment, the primary goal of the NYC program, can be achieved through three main kinds of program operations: job development, the provision of vocationally-relevant work experience, and formal skill training.

a) Effective job development is essential to NYC effectiveness. Effective job development involves locating job opportunities, working with employers to expand available opportunities, and helping enrollees to improve their job-seeking behavior. Our research indicated that this type of assistance was essential for some enrollees.

b) Vocationally relevant work assignments are essential to NYC effectiveness. In addition to providing opportunities for on-the-job training, NYC assignments should provide a variety of vocational experiences, each of which is relevant to existing employment opportunities. The number of work assignments of each type should correspond as closely as possible to the anticipated needs and interests of enrollees.

c) Formal skill training combined with work experience can, in many circumstances, achieve good results. Training in certain types of skills sometimes can be accomplished more efficiently through formal skill-training programs than through on-the-job training. The combination of the two is often an ideal arrangement. The formal training program develops a minimum level of competence in basic skills required by the job, and work experience provides practice in applying these skills in work situations. The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op program is a good example of a successful program of this type.

7

This program alternates cycles of work experience in firms that are potential employers and training in relevant skills and behaviors in the NYC Educational Center. The effectiveness of this program warrants its consideration as a model that, with appropriate modification, might serve to increase the effectiveness of NYC experience for other enrollees.

2. Enrollees can be categorized according to their needs and differential strategies can be developed.

The employability needs of enrollees cover a wide range. We have noted three general areas of deficiency: rebellious attitude toward authority, low self-esteem, and lack of opportunity. Different types of enrollees can be described as Disadvantaged Graduate, Adverse Situation, Rebel, and Low Self-Esteem. It seems that a useful program approach to enrollee employability needs is to adapt the program elements--work assignments, counseling, and remedial education--to meet these needs. It is, of course, not possible to tailor the NYC to fit each individual's needs. Broad strategies or "program mixes" can be developed, however, which permit a flexible response to enrollee employability needs and promise a higher degree of program effectiveness.

As one element in this research, an instrument was developed for measuring work-relevant attitudes. It is hoped that, when fully developed, this instrument will be useful for individual diagnosis as well as for program design and evaluation.

3. The educational needs of enrollees require active and innovative intervention.

A high proportion of enrollees, including the high school graduates, were so deficient in reading and arithmetic skills as to severely limit their employability. Thus, work-training programs, although valuable for providing credentials and for training individuals in work habits and job skills, need to be supplemented by a remedial education program. In terms of the educational needs of enrollees, the NYC educational component was generally inadequate--particularly for male enrollees. In order to improve the effectiveness of remedial education, NYC programs have two alternatives: (1) the stimulation of local school systems to the end that they will provide an effective resource, or (2) the development of NYC educational capacities.

The Accelerated Learning Experiment indicated that motivation of the enrollee is almost certainly the most important variable determining whether he will participate effectively in educational programs. A significant portion of the enrollees are extremely difficult to motivate and the educational goals of the program, therefore, must be modest if there is any reasonable prospect of their being achieved. For these reasons, three levels of remedial education should be offered to trainees with tie-ins made between the various levels so that enrollees can progress from one level to another.

a) The first level should be directed toward the enrollee with minimal motivation and should be specifically related to the job that the enrollee is to perform and should have the limited objective of improving his performance in a specific job.

b) The second level should be directed toward the remediation of the educational deficiencies of the trainee with the emphasis still placed on making the educational task relevant to work.

c) The third level, concentrated preparation for the high school equivalency test, should be available for all of those who are adequately motivated and whose educational achievement can be raised in a reasonable time to passing of the high school equivalency examination.

4. The continuation of counseling responsibility into the post-NYC period can improve the employment adjustment of former enrollees.

Follow-up interviewing identified a number of ex-enrollees who might have been helped to a satisfactory work adjustment if they had received advice and support during the difficult first months of post-NYC employment.

5. Combinations of multiple assignments, multiple enrollments, and maintained work standards may give the best results for some enrollees.

Seriously disadvantaged youth often need a number of chances--if a single opportunity were enough, most of them could succeed without special assistance. The NYC provides extra opportunity to disadvantaged youth, but the NYC itself should utilize the second--and even, third and fourth--chance concept of offered help. Many enrollees quit the NYC for the very reasons that will prevent them from achieving satisfactory employment: they can adjust no better to work training than to the world of work. For such enrollees, termination is a form of program failure and a furlough, with the opportunity to start again, regardless of the past, holds more promise of program effectiveness. Our data indicated that it is important to maintain reasonable work standards. The consistent application of standards helps the enrollee to discipline himself. At the same time, the door of the NYC should be kept open until it appears that the program cannot meet the youth's needs.

6. NYC enrollment policy that concentrates on "hard core" youth tends to limit program effectiveness.

A program which concentrates on the "hard core" will have little apparent effect and thus will not materially change the enrollee's perception of what is possible for him. A program that also serves the almost-employable, on the other hand, can achieve more effectiveness with employment outcomes providing a practical demonstration to the less-employable that it is possible for people like themselves to obtain interesting and meaningful jobs.

7. Maximum effectiveness of program operations is achieved through a balance of program components.

There is an interaction effect among program components which makes it necessary to give adequate attention to all essential components. For example, effective job development increases the value of counseling by providing an attainable goal. Effective counseling increases the value of job development by improving the attitudes of enrollees and thus making it more likely that the enrollee will be able to perform well on the job. Effective job development and counseling will increase the value of remedial education by raising an enrollee's motivation and making it more likely he will try to learn. Conversely, effective remedial education will increase the job qualifications of the enrollee.

Since this research was undertaken, the NYC has been re-organized. The present program, NYC-2, embodies some of the modifications suggested by the research described in this report. The experience of the NYC-2 program, thus, may provide a test for some of the recommendations developed in this research.

CONTENTS

Page

Summary i

Contents x

List of Tables xv

I Introduction 1
- The NYC Out-of-School Program 2
- Study Objectives 4
- Scope of Study 4
- Retrospective Study 4
- Prospective Study 5
- Special Studies 6
- "Termination" Study 7
- Clerical Co-Op Study 7
- The Accelerated Learning Experiment 8
- The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes 9
- Other Reports 10
- Rationale and Hypotheses 10
- Plan of Presentation 12

II Sites, Study Groups, and Data Collection--Prospective Study 14
- Experimental Study Groups 15
- Program Information 16
- Follow-Up Information--1968 17
- Follow-Up Information--1969 19
- Site Representation in Composite Study Groups 20
- Matches in Experimental Group--Initial, Prospective I and II 23
- Match Between Experimental and Control Groups 26
- Summary 30

III Enrollee Characteristics--Prospective Study 31
- Sex and Race 32
- Age at Time of NYC Enrollment 32
- Length of Residence 35
- Urban Backgrounds 38
- Education at the Time of NYC Enrollment 39
- Reasons for Leaving School 42
- Vocational Training or Preparation 45
- Elapsed Time Between Leaving School and Enrolling in NYC 48
- Prior Job Experience 51
- Work Ability at Time of NYC Enrollment 57
- Households at Time of NYC Enrollment 61
- Marital Status at Time of NYC Enrollment 63
- Own Children in Household at Time of NYC Enrollment 65
- Annual Family Income 66
- Size of Family 68

CONTENTS

Page

Public Housing 70
Welfare Assistance 71
Occupational Goals 72
Interviewers' Impressions 78
Interviewers' Observation of Physical Handicaps 83
Follow-Up Information Concerning Enrollee Characteristics 84
Reasons for Leaving School 84
Information Concerning the NYC--Sources of Information 89
Information Level (Control Group Subjects) 91
Summary 94

IV NYC Experience--Program Information 96
Number of Enrollments 96
Length of NYC Experience 99
Enrollments and Assignments 103
Length of Actual NYC Experience, First NYC Enrollment 105
Medical and Dental Service, First NYC Enrollment 109
Number of Work Stations, First NYC Enrollment 113
Number of Counselors, First NYC Enrollment 113
Remedial Education, First NYC Enrollment 116
Vocational Education, First NYC Enrollment 118
Counseling, First NYC Enrollment 118
NYC Assignment--Agency Worksites 122
First NYC Assignment--Kinds of Work 127
Number of Enrollees Assigned to Work Stations 132
Abilities Required in First NYC Work Assignment 136
Length of First NYC Assignment 145
Supervisors' Ratings of Enrollees' Performance 147
Work Station Attitude Towards Enrollee 152
Cooperation and Support of NYC Program by Work Station Manager 153
Attention Paid to Training by Work Supervisor 154
Supervisory Behavior and Attitude 155
Summary of Counselors' Ratings of Work Station and Supervision 157
Enrollee Gains in Preparation for the World of Work 159
Detrimental Aspects of First NYC Assignment 163
Overall Improvement, First NYC Enrollment 166
Termination Conditions, First NYC Enrollment 171
Post-NYC Plans, First NYC Enrollment 174
Single and Multiple NYC Assignment Experience 174
Work Performance and Assignment Experience, First Enrollment 175
Overall Improvement in Employability and Assignment Experience 178
Overall Improvement in Employability and Enrollment Experience 179
Summary 182

CONTENTS

Page

V NYC Experience--Enrollee Reports 187
  Length of NYC Experience 189
  Number of NYC Enrollments 193
  Kind of NYC Work 195
  Participation in Special NYC Courses 198
  NYC Counseling 203
  Perceptions of NYC Experience 212
  Liking for NYC Work 215
  Importance of NYC Work 219
  Behavior of NYC Supervisors 220
  Friendliness of Fellow-Workers 223
  Helpfulness of Counselors 225
  Usefulness of NYC Experience 227
  Post-NYC Jobs in Worksite Agencies 234
  NYC Help with Post-NYC Employment 235
  Liked and Disliked Aspects of NYC Experience 239
  The NYC Image 243
  Summary 246

VI Non-Vocational Characteristics of Study Subjects--Interview Information 250
  Return to Full-Time School 253
  Academic Courses Outside of Full-Time School 256
  Vocational Courses Outside of Full-Time School 258
  Experience in Federal Manpower Programs Other than the NYC 260
  Vocational Preparation After Leaving School 262
  Goals of Academic and Vocational Work 264
  NYC Enrollment and Other Opportunities 267
  Military Service and Draft Classification 269
  Physical Handicaps Observed by Interviewers 270
  Family Situation at the Time of Interview 271
  Marital Status 272
  Children 273
  Children and Marital Status 275
  Households at Time of Interview 277
  Sources of Support at the Time of Interview 280
  Summary 285

VII Outcomes of NYC Experience 287
  Activities at the Time of Interview 288
  Poor Outcomes 292
  Full-Time Employment at Time of Interview 295
  Activities in January, 1968, and January, 1969 297
  Activities in the 18-Months Following January 1, 1968 301
  Unemployment Among Female Subjects in the 18-Month Period 306
  Employment Since January, 1968 308
  Most Recent and Current Jobs 309
  How Study Subjects Heard About Their Most Recent or Current Jobs 312

CONTENTS

Page

Reasons for No Longer Having Most Recent Job 314
Employee Work Performance (EWP) Reports 315
Employers' Ratings of Overall Work Performance 321
10-Year Occupational Goals 322
Interviewers' Ideas on Goal Achievement 325
"Successful" and "Unsuccessful" Outcomes of NYC Experience 330
"Success" Factors--Program Information 335
"Success" Factors--Interview Information 337
Summary 340

VIII Conclusions and Implications 342
Evaluation of Primary Hypothesis 344
Enrollee Characteristics and Employability Needs 345
Program Characteristics and Employability Inputs 347
Program Achievements 349
Factors in Employment Effectiveness 353
Implications for Improved NYC Operations 354
1. The employability of enrollees is enhanced primarily through vocationally relevant NYC experience 355
a) Effective job development is essential to NYC effectiveness 355
b) Vocationally relevant work assignments are essential to NYC effectiveness 357
c) Formal skill training combined with work experience can in many instances achieve good results 358
2. Enrollees can be categorized according to their needs and differential strategies can be developed 361
a) Disadvantaged graduate group 362
b) Adverse situation group 363
c) Rebel group 363
d) Low Self-Esteem group 365
3. The educational needs of enrollees require active and innovative intervention 367
4. The continuation of counseling responsibility into the post-NYC period can improve the employment adjustment of former enrollees 371
5. Combinations of multiple assignments, multiple enrollments, and maintained work standards may give the best results for some enrollees 372
6. NYC enrollment policy that concentrates on "hard core" youth tends to limit program effectiveness 374
7. Maximum effectiveness of program operation is achieved through a balance of program components 376

CONTENTS

No. of Pages

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Initial Interview Form (SRG/NYC 01) 5
Appendix B: Work Supervisor Report Form (SRG/NYC 02) 6
Appendix C: Counselor Report Form (SRG/NYC 03) 3
Appendix D: Termination Form (SRG/NYC 04) 5
Appendix E: Interview Form (SRG/NYC 22) 19
Appendix F: Self-Report Form for Enrollee Follow-Up (SRG/NYC 22A) 4
Appendix G: Employee Work Performance Form (SRG/NYC 22B) 2
Appendix H: Marginals, SRG/NYC 22 60
Appendix I: Occupational Categories and Illustrative Jobs, Employment of Study Subjects 1
Appendix J: Occupational Categories and Illustrative Work, Occupational Goals of Study Subjects 1
Appendix K: Case Studies 70
Appendix L: Abstract ("Highlights"),"Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op" 4
Appendix M: Abstract, "The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes" 2

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1.1 NATIONAL ENROLLMENT IN NYC OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM, 1965-1968, AND PERCENT 17 YEARS OLD OR YOUNGER 3

2.1 CONSTITUTION OF EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY . . 16

2.2 1968 INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES, EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY I 18

2.3 1969 INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II 20a

2.4 SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, 4-SITE STUDY UNITS BY SEX AND SITE 21

2.5 SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, 3-SITE STUDY UNITS BY SEX AND SITE 22

2.6 SUBJECTS IN PROSPECTIVE II BY SEX, STUDY GROUP, AND SITE 22

2.7 SUBJECTS IN 4-SITE AND 3-SITE COMPOSITE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SAMPLE, PROSPECTIVE I AND PROSPECTIVE II, BY SEX AND RACE 24

2.8 MEAN YEAR OF BIRTH AND MEAN HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED, SUBJECTS IN 4-SITE AND 3-SITE COMPOSITE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY STUDY UNIT AND SEX 25

2.9 MEAN YEARS OF AGE AS OF JULY 1, 1969, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SITE, SEX, AND STUDY GROUP 26

2.10 MEAN HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SITE, SEX, AND STUDY GROUP 28

2.11 COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STUDY GROUPS, SELECTED VARIABLES AND SEX 29

3.1 SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, BY SEX, RACE, AND SITE 32

3.2 AGE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 33

3.3 AGE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX 34

3.4 YEARS LIVED IN SITE CITY AREA AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 35

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

3.5 YEARS LIVED IN SITE CITY AREA AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE. . 36

3.6 YEARS LIVED IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 37

3.7 YEARS LIVED IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 37

3.8 URBAN BACKGROUNDS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 39

3.9 HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 40

3.10 HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE. . 41

3.11 REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX 42

3.12 REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 44

3.13 VOCATIONAL TRAINING OR PREPARATION PRIOR TO NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 46

3.14 VOCATIONAL PREPARATION PRIOR TO NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 47

3.15 MONTHS OUT OF SCHOOL AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX. 49

3.16 MONTHS OUT OF SCHOOL AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 50

3.17 NO JOBS PRIOR TO NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 51

3.18 REASONS FOR NO JOBS PRIOR TO NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 52

3.19 MOST HELP IN GETTING LAST JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 53

3.20 MOST HELP IN GETTING LAST JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 54

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table — Page

3.21 REASONS NO LONGER HAVE MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 56

3.22 KINDS OF WORK ABILITY AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 58

3.23 WORK ABILITY AT THE TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 59

3.24 COMPARISONS OF VOCATIONAL PREPARATION, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, AND ABILITY TO PERFORM IN A JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX 60

3.25 LEVELS OF WORK ABILITY, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP IN CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX 61

3.26 HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 62

3.27 HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 63

3.28 MARITAL STATUS AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 64

3.29 MARITAL STATUS AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, FEMALE SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE 64

3.30 OWN CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 65

3.31 OWN CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, FEMALE SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE 66

3.32 ESTIMATED ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 67

3.33 ESTIMATED ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE. . 68

3.34 SIZE OF FAMILY AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 69

3.35 SIZE OF FAMILY AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE 70

3.36 LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 71

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

3.37 FAMILY RECEIVING WELFARE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 71

3.38 LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 73

3.39 LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 74

3.40 CHANCES OF ACHIEVING LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX 76

3.41 INTERVIEWER ESTIMATES OF LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOALS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX 78

3.42 INTERVIEWERS' IMPRESSIONS OF ENROLLEE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, MEAN RATINGS OF SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 80

3.43 INTERVIEWERS' IMPRESSIONS OF ENROLLEES AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, MEAN RATINGS OF SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 82

3.44 INTERVIEWERS' OBSERVATIONS OF PHYSICAL HANDICAPS OR DEFECTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE. . 84

3.45 MAIN REASON FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 86

3.46 ALL REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 88

3.47 HOW HEARD ABOUT NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 90

3.48 NYC INFORMATION LEVEL AND CONSIDERATION OF THE NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, CONTROL GROUP, BY SEX 92

3.49 CONSIDERATION OF NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, CONTROL GROUP, BY SEX AND RACE 93

4.1 NUMBER OF NYC ENROLLMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY ALL SUBJECTS 97

4.2 NUMBER OF NYC ENROLLMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY ALL TERMINATED SUBJECTS, BY SEX AND SITE 98

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

4.3 MEAN LENGTH OF TIME IN THE NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX 100

4.4 LENGTH OF FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX 101

4.5 LENGTH OF FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE 102

4.6 ENROLLMENTS AND WORK ASSIGNMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 104

4.7 AVERAGE HOURS WORKED PER WEEK, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 106

4.8 DAYS ACTUALLY WORKED IN NYC, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 107

4.9 DAYS ACTUALLY WORKED IN FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 108

4.10 MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 110

4.11 DENTAL EXAMINATIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 111

4.12 MEDICAL AND/OR DENTAL TREATMENT PROVIDED, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 112

4.13 NUMBER OF WORK STATIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 114

4.14 NUMBER OF ASSIGNED COUNSELORS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 115

4.15 NUMBER OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION LOCATIONS, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 117

4.16 AVERAGE COUNSELING HOURS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX . . . 119

4.17 HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE COUNSELING, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX 121

4.18 GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX 121

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table | | Page
4.19 AGENCY WORKSITES, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 123

4.20 AGENCY WORKSITES, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 125

4.21 KINDS OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX 129

4.22 KINDS OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 130

4.23 NUMBER OF ENROLLEES ASSIGNED TO WORK STATION, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 133

4.24 NUMBER OF ENROLLEES ASSIGNED TO WORK STATION, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 135

4.25 TOOL SKILLS REQUIRED FOR FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 137

4.26 TOOL SKILLS REQUIRED FOR FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE 138

4.27 LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS REQUIRED FOR FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 140

4.28 MINIMAL LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE 141

4.29 READING, MATH, WRITING, AND SPEECH SKILLS REQUIRED IN FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX 143

4.30 MINIMAL SKILL LEVELS REQUIRED IN READING, MATH, WRITING, AND SPEECH SKILLS, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT OF SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 144

4.31 LENGTH OF EARLIEST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 145

4.32 LENGTH OF EARLIEST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 146

4.33 SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 148

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table		Page
4.34	MEAN SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX	148
4.35	MEAN SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX	149
4.36	MEAN SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE . . .	151
4.37	MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF ATTITUDE TOWARD ENROLLEE IN WORK STATION, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX	152
4.38	MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF COOPERATION AND SUPPORT OF NYC PROGRAM BY WORK STATION MANAGER, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX	153
4.39	MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF ATTENTION WORK SUPERVISOR PAID TO TRAINING, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX	154
4.40	MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF WORK SUPERVISOR, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX	155
4.41	MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF WORK SUPERVISOR, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE	156
4.42	MINIMAL RATINGS OF WORK STATIONS AND SUPERVISION, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE . . .	158
4.43	ENROLLEE GAINS IN PREPARATION FOR THE WORLD OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX	160
4.44	ENROLLEE GAINS IN PREPARATION FOR THE WORLD OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE . . .	162
4.45	DETRIMENTAL ASPECTS OF FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX	164
4.46	DETRIMENTAL ASPECTS OF FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE	165
4.47	COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF OVERALL IMPROVEMENT, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE	167
4.48	COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY AREAS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX	168

LIST OF TABLE (cont.)

Table Page

4.49 IMPROVEMENT, SELECTED EMPLOYABILITY AREAS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 170

4.50 TERMINATION CONDITIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 172

4.51 TERMINATION CONDITIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 173

4.52 SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ENROLLEE WORK PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS IN FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, BY SEX 176

4.53 SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ENROLLEE WORK PERFORMANCE, FIRST AND LAST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS, BY SEX 177

4.54 SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ENROLLEE WORK PERFORMANCE, FINAL NYC ASSIGNMENT, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS, BY SEX 178

4.55 OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS, BY SEX 179

4.56 OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ENROLLMENTS, BY SEX 180

4.57 OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, FIRST AND LAST NYC ENROLLMENTS, SUBJECTS WITH MULTIPLE ENROLLMENTS, BY SEX 181

4.58 OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, LAST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ENROLLMENTS, BY SEX 182

5.1 MEAN MONTHS IN THE NYC, MEAN MONTHS SINCE NYC, AND TOTAL SPAN, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY STUDY AND SITE 188

5.2 MONTHS IN THE NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX 189

5.3 MONTHS IN THE NYC, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SEX 190

5.4 NYC EXPERIENCE, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDIES I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 192

5.5 NUMBER OF NYC ENROLLMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 194

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

5.6 NYC WORK IN MOST RECENT NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 196

5.7 OCCUPATION, MOST RECENT NYC ASSIGNMENT, COMPARISON OF RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II RESULTS, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SEX 197

5.8 PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL OR TRAINING COURSES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX . 199

5.9 PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL NYC COURSES, SELECTED VARIABLES, COMPARISONS BETWEEN RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE STUDIES, BY SEX. . 200

5.10 PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL NYC COURSES, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE . 202

5.11 FREQUENCY OF COUNSELOR MEETINGS FOR PROBLEMS, DISCUSSIONS, AND OTHER PURPOSES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE 205

5.12 FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS WITH COUNSELOR, EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS IN RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE II, BY SEX 206

5.13 FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS WITH NYC COUNSELOR, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SITE AND SEX 208

5.14 TOPICS DISCUSSED WITH COUNSELOR, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX 209

5.15 TOPICS DISCUSSED WITH COUNSELOR, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SEX . . 211

5.16 MEAN RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, BY SEX 214

5.17 MEAN LIKE-NYC-WORK RATING, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SITE AND SEX 215

5.18 REASONS FOR LIKE-NYC-WORK RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX 217

5.19 MEAN LIKE-NYC-WORK RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE 218

5.20 MEAN RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF NYC WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX 219

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

5.21 REASONS FOR IMPORTANCE-OF-NYC-WORK RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX 221

5.22 MEAN RATINGS OF CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX . . . 222

5.23 MEAN RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF SUPERVISION, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX 222

5.24 EXAMPLES OF UNHELPFUL OR HELPFUL SUPERVISOR BEHAVIOR, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SEX 224

5.25 MEAN RATINGS OF FRIENDLINESS OF FELLOW-WORKERS, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE I AND II, BY SITE AND SEX 225

5.26 MEAN RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF COUNSELORS, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX 226

5.27 MEAN RATINGS OF COUNSELOR HELPFULNESS AND REASONS FOR RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, BY SEX 228

5.28 MEAN RATINGS OF OVERALL USEFULNESS OF NYC EXPERIENCE, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX 229

5.29 ALL WAYS IN WHICH NYC EXPERIENCE WAS USEFUL AND MOST USEFUL ASPECT OF NYC EXPERIENCE, PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX 230

5.30 MOST USEFUL ASPECT OF NYC EXPERIENCE, PROSPECTIVE STUDIES I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX . 232

5.31 POST-NYC JOB IN WORKSITE AGENCY, PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX 235

5.32 NYC HELP IN GETTING POST-NYC EMPLOYMENT, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II STUDIES, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX 236

5.33 WAYS IN WHICH NYC HELPED IN GETTING POST-NYC EMPLOYMENT, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II STUDIES, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SEX 237

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table | Page

5.34 APPOINTMENTS WITH POST-NYC EMPLOYER, RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE STUDIES, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX 238

5.35 BEST-LIKED ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SEX 240

5.36 DISLIKED ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX . . . 240

5.37 NOTHING DISLIKED ABOUT NYC, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX 243

5.38 WHAT IS THERE ABOUT THE NYC THAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON WANT TO GET IN IT? EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX . 244

5.39 WHAT IS THERE ABOUT THE NYC THAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON NOT WANT TO GET IN IT? EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX 246

6.1 YEAR OF BIRTH, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 252

6.2 FULL-TIME SCHOOLING AFTER HIGH SCHOOL OR DROPOUT, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 254

6.3 PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP, HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION[a] AND SCHOOL DROPOUT 255

6.4 ACADEMIC COURSES OUTSIDE OF FULL-TIME SCHOOL, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 257

6.5 VOCATIONAL COURSES OUTSIDE OF FULL-TIME SCHOOL, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 259

6.6 EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS OTHER THAN NYC, PROSPECTIVE II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 261

6.7 ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS OTHER THAN NYC, AND VOCATIONAL COURSES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 263

6.8 GOALS OF ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL WORK UNDERTAKEN AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 266

6.9 PROPORTIONS OF SUBJECTS TAKING COURSES AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX, SITE, RACE, AND STUDY GROUP 268

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

6.10 MILITARY SERVICE AND DRAFT CLASSIFICATIONS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, MALE SUBJECTS 269

6.11 PHYSICAL HANDICAPS OBSERVED BY INTERVIEWERS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 270

6.12 MARITAL STATUS AND MONTHS MARRIED, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 272

6.13 NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 273

6.14 CHILDREN, NUMBER BORN AFTER JULY 1, 1966, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 274

6.15 CHILDREN AND MARITAL STATUS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 276

6.16 HOUSEHOLDS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 279

6.17 MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 281

6.18 ALL SOURCES OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 282

7.1 ACTIVITIES AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, ALL QUALIFIED SUBJECTS, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 289

7.2 CONSONANCE OF ACTIVITIES AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW WITH "GOOD" ADJUSTMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 290

7.3 LABOR FORCE STATUS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, ALL SUBJECTS IN LABOR FORCE, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 291

7.4 CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, SELECTED STUDIES, MALE SUBJECTS 293

7.5 CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, SELECTED STUDIES, FEMALE SUBJECTS 294

7.6 KIND OF WORK AND EARNINGS IN CURRENT FULL-TIME JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 296

7.7 ACTIVITIES ON 1/1/68 AND 1/1/69, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, INTERVIEWED MALE SUBJECTS BY STUDY GROUP 298

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table | Page

7.8 ACTIVITIES ON 1/1/68 AND 1/1/69, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, INTERVIEWED FEMALE SUBJECTS BY STUDY GROUP 299

7.9 FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF NON-NYC CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE IN JANUARY, 1968, JANUARY, 1969, AND TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 300

7.10 LABOR FORCE STATUS AND CONSONANCE WITH GOOD ADJUSTMENTS TO LIFE AND WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP . . . 302

7.11 AVERAGE TIME IN NON-NYC ACTIVITIES, AND PERCENT OF NON-NYC TIME IN ACTIVITIES, 18-MONTH PERIOD, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 303

7.12 COMPARISONS OF CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION IN 18-MONTH PERIOD, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP . . . 305

7.13 PERCENTAGE OF NON-NYC CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE TIME IN 18-MONTH PERIOD SPENT LOOKING FOR WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, FEMALE SUBJECTS BY RACE AND STUDY GROUP 307

7.14 PERCENTAGE OF NON-NYC CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE TIME IN 18-MONTH PERIOD SPENT LOOKING FOR WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, NEGRO FEMALE SUBJECTS BY SITE AND STUDY GROUP 307

7.15 EMPLOYMENT SINCE JANUARY, 1968, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 308

7.16 CURRENT AND MOST RECENT JOBS, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 310

7.17 HIGHEST HOURLY EARNINGS, CURRENT AND MOST RECENT JOBS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SITE, SEX, RACE, AND STUDY GROUP 311

7.18 HOW HEARD ABOUT CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 313

7.19 EMPLOYMENT AND REASONS FOR NO LONGER HAVING MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 314

7.20 EMPLOYERS' REPORTS ON MOST RECENT OR CURRENT JOBS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 316

7.21 EMPLOYERS' REPORTS, MOST RECENT OR CURRENT JOBS, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP 317

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table		Page
7.22	EMPLOYMENT AND REASONS FOR TERMINATION, EMPLOYERS' REPORTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	319
7.23	REASONS FOR JOB SEPARATION, SUBJECTS' REPORTS AND EMPLOYERS' REPORTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	320
7.24	EMPLOYERS' RATINGS OF OVERALL WORK PERFORMANCE, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	321
7.25	10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOALS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	323
7.26	COMPARISON OF 10-YEAR GOAL WITH MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	324
7.27	SUBJECTS' ESTIMATES OF CHANCES OF ACHIEVING 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOAL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	326
7.28	IMPEDIMENTS TO ACHIEVEMENT OF 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOAL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	327
7.29	INTERVIEWERS' ESTIMATES OF CHANCES OF SUBJECTS ACHIEVING 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOALS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	328
7.30	INTERVIEWERS' REASONS FOR GOAL ACHIEVEMENT ESTIMATES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP	329
7.31	OUTCOME CATEGORIES, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE II AND RETROSPECTIVE II, BY SEX	331
7.32	"SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX	334
7.33	SELECTED VARIABLES, PROGRAM-SOURCED INFORMATION, "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, BY SEX	336
7.34	SELECTED VARIABLES, INTERVIEW INFORMATION, "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX	339

I

Introduction

This paper constitutes the final report of a study of selected urban out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) programs. The study, begun in 1966, consisted of a number of research units undertaken to study the effectiveness of these programs--the extent to which they enhanced the employability of enrollees, and the elements in effective program operations. The two principal research units were longitudinal studies in which the effectiveness of the programs was inferred from the results of follow-up interviews conducted with NYC subjects (the Experimental group) and matched subjects without NYC experience (the Control group). The first of these studies, the Retrospective study, was undertaken in order to provide usable information in the shortest possible time, while the second study, the Prospective study, was designed to get program information during the time of NYC enrollment as well as information concerning program sequels. In addition to these longitudinal studies, the project included a number of specialized research units. These several research units, together with the background and scope of the study, are briefly described in this chapter.[1]

---

[1] The following reports have already been submitted to the Manpower Administration:

(1) "Preliminary Impressions of Problems and Issues," (Feb., 1967); (2) "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of the Cincinnati Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program," (July, 1967); (3) "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs in Four Urban Sites," (Nov., 1967); (4) A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs in Four Urban Sites, Phase II," (Oct., 1969); (5) "A Study of Terminated Enrollees in Three Urban Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs," (Feb., 1969); (6) "Summary Report and Implications for Program Effectiveness," (Dec., 1968); (7) "Methodological Considerations in Evaluative Research Involving Disadvantaged Populations," (May, 1968); (8) "The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes: A Progress Report on the Development of a Measuring Instrument," (Feb., 1969); (9) "The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes: A Second Progress Report on the Development of a Measuring Instrument," (Nov., 1969); (10) The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes: A Report on the Development of a Measuring Instrument," (July, 1970); (11) The Accelerated Learning Experiment: An Approach to the Remedial Education of Out-of-School Youth," (Nov., 1969); (12) A Proposed Model for Urban Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs," (June, 1969); (13) "A Skill-Training Model for Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs," (June, 1969).

The NYC Out-of-School Program

The Neighborhood Youth Corps, authorized under Title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, began operations in January, 1965, through three kinds of programs--in-school, summer, and out-of-school. Each of these programs was designed to help disadvantaged young persons in their preparations for adult life and the world of work through remunerated NYC enrollments. As the names of the programs suggest, however, the characteristics of enrollees and enrollments varied. The out-of-school program, of particular interest to this study, was designed to help disadvantaged young persons, aged 16-21, who were out of school and unemployed, through remunerated work-training and supportive services such as counseling and remedial education.

Aspects of NYC out-of-school enrollments--rates of remuneration, hours worked, and character of supportive services and worksites--varied somewhat in time and locality. The original authorization, for example, provided for worksites in the public sector (public agencies and certain nonprofit organizations), but a 1966 amendment to the EOA authorized work-training in non-public worksites. Apart from statutory changes such as this, local programs could be expected to vary somewhat with the resources of their localities and program personnel.

A 1966 description of the program[1] noted the following objectives and enrollment characteristics:

> The out-of-school program is designed to meet the objective of increased employability for the unemployed young men and women who are not in school, by providing the work experience and counseling that will result in their return to school; or for those youth for whom return to school is not feasible, will result in the improvement in motivation and work habits that will lead to vocational training or permanent employment.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, America's Youth at Work--Neighborhood Youth Corps, (June, 1966), p. 2.

> Enrollees in the out-of-school programs may work up to 32 hours a week, and they may be required to take part in counseling, remedial education, and other supportive services as a condition of their continuation in the program. Their enrollment is limited to six months unless the enrollee takes part in an educational program that will remedy his educational deficiencies, and move him toward a high school equivalency or formal job training.

The overall objective of the NYC out-of-school program thus might be summarized as enhanced employability, with evidence of program achievement being found in enrollee development in NYC (improved motivation, work habits, and rectification of educational deficiencies) and in sequels to NYC enrollments (return to school, enrollment in formal job training, or permanent employment).

During the period of this study, 16- and 17-year-old enrollees comprised from one-fourth to nearly one-half, depending on the time period, of the total enrollment in the out-of-school NYC (see Table 1). In 1970, the NYC out-of-school program was changed basically by its limitation to 16- and 17-year-old school dropouts. With the change in the program, the implications of the results of this study obviously are not restricted to the NYC but involve all relevant manpower programs.

TABLE 1.1

NATIONAL ENROLLMENT IN NYC OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM, 1965-1968, AND PERCENT 17 YEARS OLD OR YOUNGER

Time Period	National Enrollment	17 Years Old or Younger
	Number (thousands)	Percent
January, 1965-August, 1965	119.0	25.2
September, 1965-August, 1966	187.2	31.4
September, 1966-August, 1967	172.9	46.1
September, 1967-August, 1968	137.6	36.6

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President, (1969), Table F-8, p. 244.

Study Objectives

The study was designed and carried out with three related objectives in view: (1) to produce information bearing on overall program effectiveness and the effectiveness of program components such as counseling, remedial education, and work experience; (2) to develop recommendations with respect to program components and policies; and (3) to contribute, as possible, to evaluation methodology in the area of vocational programs for youth.

Program effectiveness was considered primarily in terms of the program's objective to enhance the employability of enrollees, and was gauged primarily in terms of the post-NYC activities of the youth studied.

Scope of Study

The study incorporated several research approaches to its objectives. Some of these research units have been reported elsewhere, and others will be more fully described in subsequent sections of this report. They are briefly described here in order to provide the general reader with an idea of the scope of the study.

Retrospective Study

The first research unit undertaken in connection with this study was a Retrospective study based on Experimental study groups (composed of enrollees) and Control study groups (composed of individuals matched to those in Experimental groups except for the fact of NYC experience).[1] Study groups were constituted in four research sites--Cincinnati, Ohio; Durham, North Carolina; East St. Louis, Illinois; and St. Louis, Missouri--and study subjects were interviewed during the winter and spring of 1967 and, for a second time, in the summer of 1968. Subjects in the Experimental groups of the Retrospective study were selected from enrollees in the program in 1965-66. Information concerning program operations in the Retrospective study, derived from reconnaissance as well as from interviews with enrollees and former enrollees, referred to the earliest phases of NYC operations.

---

[1] Retrospective study results were reported in "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs in Four Urban Sites," (November, 1967) and "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Four Urban Out-of-School NYC Programs, Phase II."

Somewhat fuller information in Cincinnati warranted a separate report for this site in the Phase I Retrospective study: "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of the Cincinnati Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program," (July, 1967).

Interviewing in Phase I of the Retrospective study (1967) was completed for 74 percent of the subjects in the Experimental study group and for 60 percent in the Control group. In addition, interviewers were able to develop information concerning the current activities of a number of subjects who could not be interviewed (out of town, in the Armed Forces, etc.). Counting these results, criterion information was secured for 83 percent of the subjects in the Experimental group, and for 72 percent of the subjects in the Control group. Phase II interviewing in the Retrospective study (1968) produced follow-up information for 81 percent of the Experimental group and for 72 percent of the Control group.

Prospective Study

A Prospective study also was begun in 1966-67. In this study, Experimental study groups were constituted from entering enrollees in four sites; and information concerning the NYC experience of these study subjects was collected during the course of their NYC enrollments. The original plan for the Prospective study included two rounds of follow-up interviews--one in the summer of 1968, and one in the summer of 1969--with these subjects, together with subjects in Control groups. Experience with the Retrospective study, however, indicated that substantial portions of the subjects in Experimental groups still would be enrolled in the NYC and thus would have little or no post-NYC experience by the summer of 1968.[1] Control groups, accordingly, although constituted, were not used in the first round of Prospective study follow-up interviews. In the second round of interviewing (1969), subjects in Control groups were interviewed in three sites,[1] and follow-up information was secured for 80 percent of the subjects in Experimental study groups and for 70 percent of the subjects in Control study groups.

---

[1] Approximately one-third of the subjects in the Experimental study group of the Retrospective study (22 percent of the male subjects, and 36 percent of the female subjects) reported NYC enrollments of more than one year.

Like the Retrospective study, the Prospective study produced follow-up information that permitted assessments of the employment effectiveness of the NYC programs studied as well as enrollee descriptions of these programs. Unlike the Retrospective study, the Prospective study also produced program descriptions based on records compiled while the enrollees were in the NYC. The Prospective study is more fully reported in Chapters 2 through 6.

Special Studies

In addition to the longitudinal Retrospective and Prospective studies, the research design included a number of special studies of factors in program effectiveness. Not all of the special studies initially contemplated eventuated in fruitful results--a study of a promising remedial education program in Durham, for example, could not be usefully completed because of changing conditions in this program. On the other hand, special studies not initially contemplated recommended themselves in the course of research--the general inadequacy of remedial education programs, for example, led to the initiation of a demonstration-research project, the Accelerated Learning Experiment. The special studies that have been reported are described below.

[1] Second-round Prospective study interviewing was not conducted in East St. Louis. The expense involved in securing adequate interview completion rates was much greater than that allowed for the budget of this study. The small size of the East St. Louis study group, and interviewing experience in this site (highest costs and lowest completion rates) together with the need to cut interviewing costs, were factors in the decision to omit this site.

"Termination" Study

A comparative study[1] of enrollees terminating from NYC out-of-school programs in the last half of 1966 was undertaken with several objectives in view. Substantively, this study attempted to compare three programs--two in Pittsburgh and one in Cincinnati--that differed in organization and job development emphasis; and procedurally, this study sought bases for comparative findings in routinely available program information and mailed self-report follow-up questionnaires. Although the completion rate for follow-up information was quite low (39 to 45 percent, depending on the study group), this study produced a number of useful results.

Program factors in employment effectiveness included NYC help in getting a job and, for enrollees with serious employability deficiencies, longer NYC enrollments than the six months averaged by the enrollees in the several study groups. Many enrollee responses, furthermore, indicated premature separation from the NYC in that the ex-enrollees were still in urgent need of enhanced employability. This aspect of the data suggested that routine follow-up of terminated enrollees, coupled with counsel and the possibility of re-enrollment, might substantially improve the employment effectiveness of NYC programs.

Clerical Co-Op Study

The study design provided for special studies of promising program components. The Cincinati NYC included such a component, a formal skill training program designed to achieve entry-level employability for enrollees interested in clerical work. The designation "Co-Op" recognized the program feature of work-training experiences in the offices of "co-operating" businesses. This training was cycled with periods of classroom work in the NYC. A study[2] of this program was, accordingly, undertaken. The study was based on an entry study group (all enrollees entering the program, beginning in May, 1966, and continuing until an N of 127 was reached), and utilized program information collected in the course of enrollment, together with follow-up information supplied by former enrollees and their employers. Completion rates were extraordinarily high in this study--97 percent of the subjects supplied follow-up information, as did 100 percent of the employers.

---

[1] "A Study of Terminated Enrollees in Three Urban Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs," (1969).

[2] Reported in "The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op: A Formal Skill Training Program," (1969).

Follow-up information, secured in the summer of 1968, indicated that 72 percent of the Co-Op subjects who were in the labor force at that time had full-time jobs. Results such as this tended to substantiate the impression that the program was effective, and suggested that the employment effectiveness of NYC programs generally might be enhanced by similar skill training programs realistically coordinated with job opportunities in clerical and other fields. On the other hand, the characteristics of the Co-Op enrollees--female, average completion of 11.1 school grades, 97 percent with some previous clerical training, and 67 percent with occupational goals in the clerical field--indicated that such formal skill training programs could provide only partial solutions to problems of employment effectiveness in that many enrollees, particularly male enrollees, had far less schooling and vocational training.

The Accelerated Learning Experiment

One of the greatest impediments to employment among NYC enrollees was inadequate schooling,[1] yet provisions for remedial education were uniformly ineffective in the programs studied. This circumstance led to the institution of the Accelerated Learning Experiment (ALE)[1] which provided for the experimental use and evaluation of new remedial education techniques. The ALE used the system of programmed instruction and materials developed for the Job Corps Conservation Centers, and was conducted in various classroom-teacher arrangements in three sites: Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis. The ALE was run in two periods, the first, of six months, and the second, of nine months, and concluded with a three-day workshop in Washington.

---

[1] School grade completed was significantly associated with successful employment sequels to NYC enrollment in all studies.

The ALE indicated that individual programmed instruction used in classes at or near the worksite with non-certificated teachers could provide significant assistance to some out-of-school NYC enrollees. At the same time, experience with the ALE showed that the Job Corps materials were inadequate in some ways and that the effectiveness of this approach to remedial education could be enhanced through the supplementation of materials.

The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes

Persuasive evidence appeared in the course of the present research, as well as in other research, that the attitudes of disadvantaged youth play a critical role in their adjustment to the world of work. The effectiveness of work-training programs thus may often depend on the modification of the work-relevant attitudes of enrollees. At present, however, there is no general agreement regarding the ways in which attitudes are related to work-training and to work adjustment or how they should be measured. The probable importance of a valid measure of work-relevant attitudes, both as an analytic tool in research and as a diagnostic tool in program planning, led to research designed to develop a measure of work-relevant attitudes.[2]

[1] Reported in "The Accelerated Learning Experiment: An Approach to the Remedial Education of Out-of-School Youth," (1969).

[2] Reported in "The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes: A Report on the Development of a Measuring Instrument," (1970).

A series of investigations using an initial and a refined inventory administered to three out-of-school groups (NYC, New Careers, and delinquent) and four in-school groups (NYC, and students in a suburban high school, an inner-city high school, and an urban vocational high school) produced three interpretable factors: Optimism, Unsocialized Attitudes, and Self-Confidence. A revised inventory was prepared on the basis of these results and is currently being tested.

Other Reports

As this research has progressed, the practical implications of our experience and of study findings have been of continuing concern. These implications have been noted in the reports described above, and in two separate reports.[1]

Rationale and Hypotheses

The theoretical framework of this study utilized socialization concepts and related hypotheses, or researchable issues. The socialization process--the development of a helpless infant into an adult member of society--is long and complex and involves the acquisition of a range of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values through family, school, and community experiences. Socialization is considered successful if the individual develops the capacity to achieve adequate levels of satisfaction through legitimate channels.

To achieve satisfactions through socially desirable channels, an individual must possess essential skills, have appropriate opportunities, and believe that he can obtain satisfactions through the realization of such opportunities. Socialization requirements are so complex that a child cannot learn all that he needs to know through direct experience. Role models, consequently, are as important to successful socialization as opportunities to acquire social skills. By the same token, lack of opportunity, lack of required skills, lack of confidence in his own abilities, or lack of appropriate role models makes it more likely that an individual's socialization will be inadequate and that he will either seek satisfactions through illegitimate channels or will settle for low standards of achievement.

---

[1] "Methodological Considerations in Evaluative Research Involving Disadvantaged Populations," (1968); and "Implications for Program Operations and Research," (1969).

Socialization is a slow process and a child usually has repeated opportunities to learn what he needs to know. At the same time, the process involves graduated or sequential development so that if, for any reason, a child gets out of the "mainstream" it may be very difficult for him to get back into it. If, for example, a 16-year-old has not learned some of the skills ordinarily acquired by 10-year-olds, it may be very difficult for him to achieve this particular type of learning. He cannot re-enter the world of the 10-year-old; and, not having acquired this skill, it may be difficult or impossible for him to acquire more complex skills at a later stage of development. There is thus often a pressing need to supplement the socialization process of young persons whose socialization has been inadequate by giving them additional opportunities to acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes and values that they will need to function as productive adults in our society.

As a work-training program, the NYC focused on one aspect of supplementary socialization: the enhancement of the skills, knowledge, attitudes and values related to successful adjustment to the world of work. In helping disadvantaged young persons to adjust to the vocational world, the program faced a multi-dimensional task. Clearly, the program had to give priority consideration to strengthening deficient vocational and academic skills. Before this could be accomplished, however, it would often be necessary to bring social skills--behaviors in work situations involving superiors and co-workers--to a level that would permit productive participation in work-training.

The primary hypothesis of the study was that the NYC programs studied helped enrollees to achieve satisfactory adjustments to the adult world, particularly to the world of work. The complex task of the NYC involved meeting a variety of employability needs which, in turn, gave rise to a number of subsidiary issues. These issues were implicit in the circumstances, apparent at the outset of the study, that the employability needs of enrollees and the capacity of programs to meet these needs would be differential. Beyond the recognition of such factors in employability effectiveness, however, initial knowledge did not permit the formulation of secondary hypotheses. Such issues, rather, evolved in the course of the study; the findings of one research unit often became the hypotheses--or researchable questions--of subsequent research units. These findings have been presented in the reports cited, and will be summarized in connection with data reports in the appropriate parts of this report.

Plan of Presentation

As indicated earlier, this paper serves two purposes: (1) it reports the results of the longitudinal Prospective study; and (2) it serves as the final report of the research project of which the Prospective study was a part. The three chapters immediately following describe the design of the Prospective study and report results derived from program-sourced information--the characteristics of subjects in the Experimental group at the time of NYC enrollment, and the reports of Work Supervisors and Counselors concerning the NYC experience of study subjects. The remaining chapters, based on follow-up interviews with study subjects, discuss study results with respect to the variables of interest--the matching variables in the several study groups, and the criterion or outcome variables apparent in interview data.

From the above outline it is apparent that the major portion of the space of this report is taken up with the Prospective study. The results of other studies, however ,are reflected as appropriate in the discussions of Prospective study results and in the final chapter which deals with study results in relation to study hypotheses and related issues.

II

Sites, Study Groups, and Data Collection
Prospective Study

In May, 1966, NYC programs in four cities were selected as research sites for the project's longitudinal, Experimental-Control studies. These sites--Cincinnati, Ohio; Durham, North Carolina; East St. Louis, Illinois; and St. Louis, Missouri--were selected through field reconnaissance and consultation with the NYC staff in Washington, D.C., according to the following criteria:

--Programs should be in full operation and appear to be running well:

--Program administrators should indicate interest in, and support for, the research project;

--The several sites should provide as much variation as possible with respect to local conditions and program elements; and

--Selection as a site should not subject the program to research overload.

At the time of their selection, these NYC programs were in their first full year of operation. In the two larger cities--Cincinnati and St. Louis--the sponsoring agencies of the NYC had gained some experience with the problems of disadvantaged youth; while, in the two smaller sites, the sponsoring agencies had become operational at about the same time as the NYC[1]. The sites thus provided variety in terms of geographical region, size, and community resources. In each site, however, the NYC programs were vigorous and promising. These sites were used in the Retrospective study, already reported elsewhere, and in the Prospective study, reported hereinafter.

---

[1] See Chapter II of the Retrospective Study, Phase I, Report (pp. 6-16) for fuller description of sites.

Experimental Study Groups

Experimental study groups were constituted between August, 1966, and spring of 1967. These groups were composed of entering enrollees in each site, the general procedure being to place new applicants in the group until the number of new enrollees reached a statistically desirable size. N's in the neighborhood of 130 were sought. In East St. Louis, however, the intake rate was exceptionally low. In this site, an N of 96 was accepted since a larger N could have been obtained only by extending the selection period far beyond the selection periods of other sites.

Before final assignment to Experimental study groups, NYC records were checked in order to make sure that potential study subjects were eligible as new enrollees in the several out-of-school NYC programs. The most common sources of ineligibility were failure to report to any worksite, enrollment in in-school, instead of out-of-school program, and re-enrollment, instead of initial enrollment, in 1966. These preliminary checks were fairly successful in Cincinnati, East St. Louis, and St Louis in that follow-up interviewing disclosed very few ineligibles (see Table 2.1). In Durham, however, a number of subjects were found to be ineligible because they were in the in-school NYC. These subjects had been assigned to worksites that were also used in the out-of-school program, and their ineligibility was not ascertained prior to their assignment to the Experimental study group. Indeed, the ineligibility of some of these Durham subjects was not ascertained until their follow-up interviews had been completed.

TABLE 2.1

CONSTITUTION OF EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY

	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	Total
Number in group, initial constitution	134	136	96	128	494
Deletions prior to interviewing	0	12	0	0	12
Deletions after interviewing	0	9	2	1	12
Number in group, final constitution	134	115	94	127	470

Program Information

As they enrolled in the NYC, individuals in the Experimental study groups were interviewed by NYC staff members. This Initial Interview[1] recorded first impressions of the enrollee's appearance, speech, and attitudes as well as some demographic data additional to that available on the standard NYC enrollment form.

Information concerning the NYC experience of enrollee subjects was developed through Work Supervisor reports, Counselor reports, and Termination Forms.[2] The Supervisor and Counselor reports were completed by the enrollee's Supervisor and Counselor at the conclusion of each work assignment, while the Termination

---

[1] The Initial Interview (SRG/NYC 01) is appended as Appendix A. The study design originally provided for the administration of the Job Corps Reading Test at the time of enrollment in order to secure baseline information concerning functional educational level. This part of the design was abandoned because the test was not uniformly administered in all sites.

[2] The Work Supervisor report form (SRG/NYC 02), and Counselor report form (SRG/NYC 03), and the Termination Form (SRG/NYC 04) are appended as Appendices B, C, and D, respectively.

Form was completed by the enrollee's counselor at the conclusion of his NYC enrollment. In addition to summarizing the enrollment, the Termination Form reported exit impressions of the enrollee's appearance, speech, and attitudes.

Follow-Up Information--1968

When the Prospective study was designed, it was anticipated that most of the subjects in Experimental groups would have completed their NYC enrollments in 1967 and that follow-up interviewing in the summer of 1968 would substantially reflect post-NYC experience. In accord with this, it was planned to constitute Control study groups composed of subjects matched to those in the Experimental groups except for NYC experience, and to conduct follow-up interviewing in 1968 with subjects in both Experimental and Control study groups. Data from the Retrospective studies indicated, however, that NYC enrollments were often considerably longer than had been thought at the time the research was designed. The extent of post-NYC experience reflected in 1968 interviews, consequently, would tend to be too limited to show program effects. These considerations indicated that the expense of interviewing subjects in Control groups of the Prospective study in 1968 would not be justified. The 1968 round of interviewing in the Prospective study, therefore, involved only subjects in the Experimental study groups.

Interviewers secured complete interviews from 72 percent of the subjects in the composite Experimental study group in 1968 (see Table 2.2).[1] In addition, activity at the time of interview--information essential to the evaluation of the major study hypothesis--was secured for another nine percent of these subjects in two other ways. In some instances, the interviewer was able to obtain the mailing addresses of subjects who could not be interviewed because they had moved. A short self-report form was sent to these subjects. The completion of this form added to the available information. In other instances, interviewers were able to find out the current activities of subjects who had left the city from secondary reports.

---

[1] The interview form used in Prospective Study I was substantially the same as that used in Prospective II, which is appended as Appendix E. Similarly, the self-report form used in 1968 was essentially the same as that used in 1969, which is appended as Appendix F.

TABLE 2.2

1968 INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES, EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY I

Interviewing Outcomes	Cin'ti. N=134	Durham N=115	East St. Louis N=94	St. Louis N=127	Total N=470
			Percent		
Activity ascertained by:					
Interview[a]	83%	65%	63%	74%	72%
Self-report	3	1	0	0	1
Secondary report to interviewer	9	5	10	9	8
Sub-total, activity ascertained	95%	71%	73%	83%	81%
Activity not ascertained	5%	29%	28%	16%	18%
TOTAL[b]	100%	99%	101%	99%	99%

[a] Twelve subjects were found to be ineligible for the Experimental study group after they had been interviewed. The inclusion of these subjects would increase the actual interview completion rate to 75 percent.

[b] In this and in subsequent tables, percentages have been rounded and consequently do not always total 100 percent.

Ordinarily, the secondary sources of information were members of the subjects' families who supplied activity reports indicating that the subject was (most frequently) in the Armed Forces or (less frequently) in the Job Corps, school or jail.

Follow-Up Information--1969

In the summer of 1969, follow-up interviews[1] were conducted with subjects in Experimental and Control study groups in three sites. The fourth site, East St. Louis, was dropped from this phase of the study because of rising interview costs in general; and because, in particular, interviewing in this smallest site had proved to be more difficult and more expensive than interviewing in the other sites.

Control study groups were constituted, in Cincinnati and St. Louis, from NYC applicants who did not enroll in the program. In St. Louis, applicants were randomly assigned to the Experimental and Control groups. Every second applicant was enrolled and the others were rejected. This is, of course, the ideal method of constituting a control group, but there were resulting problems; many of those applicants who were rejected and assigned to the Control group reapplied for enrollment later, were accepted, and had to be deleted from the Control group before interviewing began. This may have "creamed off" the more determined and persistent members of the control group, and created a bias which brings into question its comparability on the basis of random selection.

In Cincinnati, about one-third of the Control group was composed of applicants who were ineligible for NYC on the basis of income. The other two-thirds were applicants who did not follow through on enrollment for one reason or another.

---

[1] The 1969 interview form (SRG/NYC 22) is appended as Appendix E. This form was substantially similar to that used in the 1968 round of interviews (SRG/NYC 21).

Durham Control group members were derived from applicants to the State Employment Service. The records of these applicants were searched to find individuals who matched subjects in the Experimental study group in terms of race, sex, age, and educational level, but who had not enrolled in the NYC.

Interviewers secured complete interviews from 72 percent of the subjects in the composite Experimental group, and from 65 percent of the subjects in the composite Control study group (see Table 2.3). Other sources of information brought the portion of subjects for whom activity information was available to 80 percent in the Experimental study group and to 70 percent in the Control study group.[1]

One item in the interview form provided for the identification of the study subject's current or most recent employer. As interviews were completed, this information was used to mail short Work Performance forms[2] to these employers. A total of 373 forms were mailed, with 67 percent being completed, and 13 percent being returned without completion either because the Post Office could not locate the employer or the employer had no record of the employee-subject.

Prospective Study Groups

Follow-up information secured in first- and second-round interviewing in the Prospective unit of this research reflected major portions of the study groups involved. Comparisons of the characteristics of subjects in the interviewed portions of the Experimental group with those of the initial Experimental group, as well as with--in Prospective II--characteristics of interviewed subjects in the Control group, indicated satisfactory matches had been achieved with respect to a number of independent variables.

---

[1] The self-report form used in Prospective Study II is appended as Appendix F.

[2] The Employee Work Performance (SRG/NYC 22B) form is appended as Appendix G.

TABLE 2.3

1969 INTERVIEWING OUTCOMES, EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II

Interviewing Outcomes	Cin'ti.		Durham		St. Louis		Total	
	Exp. N=134	Con. N=129	Exp. N=115	Con. N=115	Exp. N=126	Con. N=128	Exp. N=375	Con. N=372
				Percent				
Activity ascertained by:								
Interview	84%	69%	72%	55%	57%	43%	72%	56%
Interview (ineligible)[a]	0	5	0	10	0	12	0	9
Self-report	3	2	2	2	1	0	2	1
Secondary report	4	9	5	1	8	2	6	4
Sub-total, activity ascertained	91%	85%	79%	68%	66%	57%	80%	70%
Activity not ascertained	8%	16%	21%	33%	33%	44%	20%	31%
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%	101%	99%	101%	100%	101%

[a] In the Control study groups, nine percent of the subjects became ineligible because they enrolled in the NYC. This ineligibility was discovered through interview.

Site Representation in Composite Study Groups

While this research assumed at the outset that the NYC programs in the several sites would vary with respect to emphases and outcomes, it was also recognized that some sources of variation could not be identified or usefully controlled. Gross differences between sites, however, were generally controlled by similarities in site representation in comparative study units.

Among female subjects in Experimental groups of the Prospective Study, site representation was substantially similar in the varous groups (see Tables 2.4 and 2.5). Among male subjects, however, Cincinnati's representation in the Prospective II group (52 percent) was significantly larger than Cincinnati's representation in the comparable Initial Experimental group (36 percent). At the same time, much of the Prospective II Cincinnati increase was at the expense of the other metropolitan site, St. Louis, so that Prospective II results reflected metropolitan sites to about the same extent as the Initial Experimental group.

TABLE 2.4

SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY,[a]
4-SITE STUDY UNITS BY SEX AND SITE

	Male		Female	
Site	Initial N=156	Prosp. I N=89	Initial N=314	Prosp. I N=252
	Percent			
Cincinnati	27%	36%	29%	31%
Durham	19	15	27	25
East St. Louis	25	22	18	15
St. Louis	29	27	26	29
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

[a] Subjects in Initial Experimental group, and subjects in Experimental group interviewed in first-round interviewing.

TABLE 2.5

SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, 3-SITE STUDY UNITS BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male Initial N=117	 Pro.I N=69	 Pro.II[a] N=64	Female Initial N=259	 Pro.I N=213	 Pro.II[a] N=212
				Percent		
Cincinnati	36%	46%	52%	37%	37%	40%
Durham	26	19	23	33	29	33
St. Louis	38	35	25	31	34	27
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%

[a]Subjects interviewed in second round of interviewing.

Site representation in the comparative study groups of Prospective II indicated that gross variation associated with site was also controlled in these results (see Table 2.6). Again, the similarities with respect to groups of female subjects were closer than in groups composed of male subjects.

TABLE 2.6

SUBJECTS IN PROSPECTIVE II BY SEX, STUDY GROUP, AND SITE

Site	Male Experimental N=64	 Control N=69	Female Experimental N=212	 Control N=142
			Percent	
Cincinnati	52%	45%	40%	42%
Durham	23	33	33	30
St. Louis	25	22	27	28
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

These results indicated that, particularly with groups composed of female subjects, composite groups were comparable with respect to site representation.

Matches in Experimental Group--Initial, Prospective I, and Prospective II

The initial composite Experimental group was composed of young men and women who entered NYC programs in four sites between August, 1966, and spring, 1967. Follow-up interviews with these subjects in the summer of 1968 (Prospective I) produced information concerning 82 percent of the subjects, and a follow-up composite Experimental group that closely matched the initial group with respect to race (see Table 2.7). One site, East St. Louis, did not figure in the second round of follow-up interviews (Prospective II) which reached 80 percent of the potential subjects. Excluding this site from the initial and Prospective I composite Experimental groups tended to increase the proportion of white subjects (all of the East St. Louis subjects were Negro), but did not otherwise affect the close racial match between the several composite Experimental groups.

Comparisons of average years of birth and highest school grade completed (see Table 2.8) indicated that the composite Experimental groups in Prospective I and II were substantially similar to the relevant initial composite Experimental groups. In each comparison, however, male subjects tended to be younger and less educated than female subjects.

TABLE 2.7

SUBJECTS IN 4-SITE AND 3-SITE COMPOSITE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS,[a] PROSPECTIVE STUDY SAMPLE, PROSPECTIVE I, AND PROSPECTIVE II, BY SEX AND RACE

Study Group and Race	Male	Female
4-Site Composite Experimental Study Group	N=156	N=314
White	17%	8%
Negro	83	92
4-Site Prospective I Follow-Up	N=89	N=252
White	16%	6%
Negro	84	94
3-Site Composite Experimental Study Group	N=117	N=259
White	22%	10%
Negro	78	90
3-Site Prospective I Follow-Up	N=69	N=213
White	20%	7%
Negro	80	93
3-Site Prospective II Follow-Up	N=64	N=212
White	20%	9%
Negro	80	91

---

[a] 4-Site Experimental study group included subjects in Cincinnati, Durham, East St. Louis, and St. Louis. 3-Site group did not include East St. Louis.

TABLE 2.8

MEAN YEAR OF BIRTH AND MEAN HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED,[a] SUBJECTS IN 4-SITE AND 3-SITE COMPOSITE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY STUDY UNIT AND SEX

Composite Group and sex	Experimental Group, Pro-Spective Study		Prospective I		Prospective II	
	(N)[b]	Mean	(N)[b]	Mean	(N)[b]	Mean
Mean Year of Birth						
4-site composite group						
Male	(156)	1948.5	(89)	1948.7		
Female	(313)	1948.0	(252)	1948.1		
3-site composite group						
Male	(117)	1948.7	(69)	1948.8	(64)	1948.8
Female	(258)	1948.0	(213)	1948.1	(212)	1948.1
Mean Highest School Grade						
4-site composite group						
Male	(155)	9.2	(89)	9.3		
Female	(310)	9.9	(250)	9.9		
3-site composite group						
Male	(116)	9.0	(69)	9.2	(64)	9.3
Female	(225)	9.8	(212)	9.9	(205)	9.9

[a] Highest school grade at time of NYC enrollment in Prospective Study Experimental group, and highest school grade at time of first dropout in Prospective I and II.

[b] (N's) indicate number reporting.

On the average, male subjects were about 18 years old in the summer of 1966 while female subjects were about 18⅓; and female subjects averaged about half a grade more of schooling. Both male and female subjects averaged more than ninth grade schooling--very little more, in the case of male subjects (9.2) and somewhat more (9.9) in the case of female subjects.

Match Between Experimental and Control Groups

Dichotomized on sex of interviewed subjects, the Experimental and Control study groups matched fairly closely on a number of major independent variables. On the average, female subjects in the Experimental group were only .2 of a year younger than female subjects in the Control group (see Table 2.9). The match between male subjects was less close, subjects in the Experimental group being, on the average, .8 of a year younger than those in the Control group.

TABLE 2.9

MEAN YEARS OF AGE AS OF JULY 1, 1969, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SITE, SEX, AND STUDY GROUP

Site	Male		Female	
	Experimental	Control	Experimental	Control
		Mean		
Cincinnati	20.8	21.8	21.7	21.7
Durham	20.7	21.3	21.6	22.1
St. Louis	19.3	21.1	21.0	20.9
All Sites	20.7	21.5	21.4	21.6

Since the study groups were matched with respect to age at the time they were constituted, these results are due to changes in the composition of the Control groups, either through deletions from the group of younger subjects because of enrollment in the NYC program or greater difficulty in locating the younger Control group males. As of July 1, 1969--when second-round interviewing commenced--all subjects were close to their 21st year of age, on the average, with male subjects in the St. Louis Experimental group being youngest and female subjects in the Durham Experimental group being oldest.

Comparable study subjects averaged the same highest school grade completed--9.9 grades among female subjects, and 9.3 grades among male subjects (see Table 2.10). On a number of other background variables, also, there were no significant[1] differences between the comparative study groups (see Table 2.11). These variables indicated that the great majority of subjects, regardless of sex or study group, were long-time residents of their cities and almost all of them had been in the city since before the inception of NYC programs. Up to the age of 16, 30 percent of the subjects in the Control group had lived in mother-only families. While slightly more of the subjects in the Experimental group reported this circumstance, the differences between the two groups in this respect were not significant. Although slightly more of the female subjects in the Experimental group, and slightly more of the male subjects in the Control group, reported welfare assistance all or most of the time while they were growing up, the differences between study groups in this respect were not significant.

All of the subjects in the Experimental group had qualified for NYC enrollment as members of low-income families. This important matching variable--family income in 1966--was not directly developed in follow-up interviewing--the source of information concerning subjects in the Control group.

[1] See fn. Table 2.11 for explanation of "significant" in this report.

TABLE 2.10

MEAN HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED,[a] INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SITE, SEX, AND STUDY GROUP

Site	Male		Female	
	Experimental	Control	Experimental	Control
		Mean		
Cincinnati	9.4	10.1	10.4	10.1
Durham	8.9	8.4	9.5	9.6
St. Louis	9.4	9.3	9.5	9.3
All Sites	9.3	9.3	9.9	9.9

[a] Highest school grade completed at time of first dropout.

TABLE 2.11

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL STUDY GROUPS SELECTED VARIABLES AND SEX

Variables	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Male CL[a]	Female Exp. N=212	Female Con. N=142	Female CL[a]
	Percent			Percent		
In city 5 or more years	97%	96%	ns	95%	93%	ns
Up to age 16:						
Lived in mother-only family	35%	30%	ns	39%	30%	ns
Welfare assistance all or most of time	20%	27%	ns	27%	23%	ns
Principal adult[b]:						
Completed 8 grades or less	48%	56%	ns	44%	50%	ns
Unskilled occupation or none	52%	51%	ns	59%	56%	ns

[a] CL=Confidence Level, or degree of assurance that observed differences should be attributed to chance. The notation "ns" (not significant) indicates that, in the judgment of the author, the difference should be attributed to chance.

Throughout this report, certain conventions regarding "significance" will be observed. The adjective "significant" is reserved for descriptions of statistical significance and connotes differences that could be expected to occur by chance no more than 5 times in 100. "Very significant" connotes differences that could be expected to occur by chance no more than 1 time in 100.

To help avoid Type II errors, notice is sometimes taken of probability levels which are between .05 and .25 when evidence from other sources suggests that they should be noted. Such levels are never referred to as significant but should be considered to represent a zone of suspended judgment with respect to the relationship being considered.

Standard statistical procedures have been used to determine Confidence Levels. The significance of differences between means has been evaluated through the t-test formula, and the significance of differences between percentages has been evaluated through an adaptation of the t-test formula. This adaptation is described in the monograph:

Vernon Davies, Rapid Method for Determining Significance of Difference Between Two Percentages. Institute of Agricultural Science, Washington State University Stations Circular 151 (revised July, [illegible]2).

[b] Principal adult was male head of household or, if family lacked male head of household, the female head of household.

Subjects in the comparative study groups matched closely, however, in terms of two factors in family economic status--educational level and occupation of the head of family. Not only were there no significant differences between subjects in the comparative study groups in the lower ranges of education and occupation, as shown in Table 2.11; but, also, the distributions of "higher" educations and occupations were similar. From 12 to 17 percent of the principal adults whose education was reported, for example, were reported to have at least high school educations; and subjects in the Experimental groups were as apt as subjects in Control groups to report this level of Principal Adult education. With respect to occupational level, less than 10 percent of the reported usual occupations of Principal Adults were "above"[1] skilled manual work and, again, subjects in Experimental groups were as apt as subjects in Control groups to report these occupational levels.

Summary

In this chapter, the overall design of the Prospective Study was described, and the coverage of follow-up interviewing in 1968 and 1969 was reported. Although follow-up was more successful in some sites than in others, follow-up results were generally adequate in that the basic characteristics of subjects in follow-up groups of interest were substantially similar to those of the subjects in relevant comparative groups.

---

[1] The occupations of Principal Adults were coded according to the occupational ranks described in August B. Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position (1965 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn., 1957). Occupations ranked above skilled manual work were technician, clerical, semiprofessional, and professional.

III

Enrollee Characteristics
Prospective Study

The first information concerning subjects in the Experimental group of the Prospective study was collected on the Initial Form[1] as the subjects entered the NYC in the summer of 1966. Like the information concerning NYC experience, reported in the following chapter, initial information was supplied by personnel regularly involved in NYC procedures in the several research sites. Except in Durham, where Employment Service personnel completed standard NYC enrollment forms and also completed the Initial Form of the Prospective study, NYC personnel completed the Initial Form either at the time the subject applied for enrollment or shortly after enrollment had been completed. The design of the Prospective study was based on the active cooperation of the programs selected for study in that the programs undertook to supply information concerning the NYC experience of study subjects on information forms supplied by the research group. The study objective of securing such information at the time of the experience made it essential to provide for data collection inside the programs. In three of the programs--Cincinnati, Durham, and St. Louis--field supervisors for the research were also NYC employees. In the fourth site, East St. Louis, the research supervisor was not an NYC employee; and, possibly for this reason, results tended to be less complete in East St. Louis than in the other sites.

[1] See Appendix A, Initial Interview form (SRG/NYC 01).

Sex and Race

Female subjects made up two-thirds of the composite Experimental group in the Prospective study, and nine out of ten of all subjects were Negro (see Table 3.1). The predominance of female and of Negro subjects was apparent in each site. Since many of the variables developed in this study were sex-associated, data have generally been reported by sex. In most instances, the small proportion of white subjects did not warrant analyses reflecting sex and race.

TABLE 3.1

SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, BY SEX, RACE, AND SITE

Sex and Race	Cin'ti. N=134	Durham N=115	East St. Louis N=94	St. Louis N=127	All Sites N=470
			Percent		
Male					
White	9%	7%	0%	5%	5%
Negro	22	19	41	31	28
Sub-total, male	31%	26%	41%	36%	33%
Female					
White	5%	12%	0%	3%	5%
Negro	63	62	59	61	62
Sub-total, female	68%	74%	59%	64%	67%
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Age at Time of NYC Enrollment

When they enrolled in the NYC most of the subjects in the Prospective study were teenagers (see Table 3.2). The ages shown in Table 2.2 are approximate in that they reflect the differences between the enrollment year (1966-67) and birth years (1945 through 1950) rather than complete birth and enrollment dates (that is, month and day as well as year). Although the actual ages of study subjects at the time of their real NYC enrollment in the fall of 1966 through the spring of 1967 might thus be slightly different, the approximate ages shown in Table 3.2 are substantially accurate and indicated that male subjects tended to be younger than female subjects. Nearly three-fifths of the male subjects were born in 1949, or later, and were thus in their 17th year, or less, in 1966. Very significantly fewer female subjects (38 percent) were born in 1949, or later. Median ages in the two groups (16.7 among male subjects, and 18.5 among female subjects) reflected this difference more sharply than mean ages which--particularly among the male subjects--were more influenced by older subjects.

TABLE 3.2

AGE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Age[a]	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
16	28%	16%
17	31	22
18	21	25
19	10	21
20	6	12
21	4	4
TOTAL	100%	100%
Mean age, 7/1/66 (years)	18.0	18.5
Median age	16.7	18.5

[a] Age based on year of birth subtracted from 1966 (enrollment year). Mean age based on mean year of birth subtracted from 1966.5 (date representing time of enrollment).

In each of the sites (see Table 3.3) the tendency of male subjects to be younger than female subjects was evident to some extent. Subjects in St. Louis--both male and female--were significantly younger, however, than those in other sites: 71 percent of the male, and 53 percent of the female, subjects in St. Louis being in their 16th or 17th years in 1966. Subjects in East St. Louis, on the other hand, tended to be older in that only 48 percent of the male, and 29 percent of the female, subjects in this site were in their 16th or 17th year in 1966, while 23 percent of the male subjects and 15 percent of the female subjects were in their 20th or 21st years in 1966. The other two sites--Cincinnati and Durham--were closely similar with respect to the ages of enrollees in the Prospective study.

TABLE 3.3

AGE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Age[a]	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
16	26%	27%	15%	42%
17	31	30	33	29
18	24	23	23	16
19	14	13	5	7
20, or more	5	6	23	7
TOTAL	100%	99%	99%	101%
Mean age, 7/1/66 (years)	17.9	18.0	18.5	17.5
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=314
16	14%	12%	9%	25%
17	17	22	20	28
18	27	26	35	16
19	25	18	22	21
20, or more	16	23	15	8
TOTAL	99%	101%	101%	98%
Mean age, 7/1/66 (years)	18.7	18.7	18.7	18.1

[a] Age based on year of birth subtracted from 1966 (enrollment year). Mean age based on mean year of birth subtracted from 1966.5 (date representing time of enrollment).

Length of Residence

At the time of their enrollment in the NYC, most subjects--85 percent of the male, and 89 percent of the female, subjects--had lived in their respective site cities six or more years (see Table 3.4). Reports of shorter residencies, implying migration to the site cities in the relatively recent past, indicated more very recent migration (in the city one year or less) than would be expected. Recent migration to the city was most in evidence in Durham (see Table 3.5) where 17 percent of the male, and 15 percent of the female, subjects were reported to have been in the city one year or less. Fifteen percent of the male subjects in East St. Louis, also, had been in the city one year or less; but, in East St. Louis, only two percent of the female subjects were this new to the city. Even though recent migration to the city was less evident in other sites, the proportions of subjects who had been in the city one year or less were higher than would be expected on the basis of the percentages of those in the city from two through five years.

TABLE 3.4

YEARS LIVED IN SITE CITY AREA AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT,
PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Years	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
One year or less	11%	6%
One-two years	1	2
Two-five years	4	4
Six-ten years	13	7
More than ten years	72	82
TOTAL	101%	101%
Unknown (number)	(12)	(10)

TABLE 3.5

YEARS LIVED IN SITE CITY AREA AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Years	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=34	N=45
One year or less	5%	17%	15%	9%
One-five years	7	4	6	2
More than five years	88	78	80	89
TOTAL	100%	99%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(7)	(5)	(0)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
One year or less	6%	12%	2%	2%
One-five years	5	6	4	5
More than five years	88	63	94	93
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(7)	(3)	(0)

In contrast to the stable conditions predominantly reflected in the number of years that subjects had lived in their cities, years in the neighborhood of residence at the time of NYC enrollment indicated a great deal of intra-city movement (see Table 3.6). About one-third of the subjects had been in their neighborhoods one year or less, about one-third, two through five years, and about one-third six or more years. Intra-city mobility was marked in each of the sites (see Table 3.7). In Cincinnati, the site showing least intra-city mobility, for example, three out of five subjects had been in their neighborhoods five years or less, while the comparable proportion rose to seven out of ten in St. Louis.

TABLE 3.6

YEARS LIVED IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Years	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
One year or less	33%	37%
One-two years	9	12
Two-five years	21	18
Five-ten years	19	13
More than ten years	18	20
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(4)

TABLE 3.7

YEARS LIVED IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Years	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
		Percent		
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=34	N=45
One year or less	17%	36%	41%	40%
One-five years	39	21	27	31
More than five years	45	43	33	29
TOTAL	101%	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(0)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
One year or less	29%	38%	38%	45%
One-five years	29	30	43	22
More than five years	42	31	18	33
TOTAL	100%	99%	99%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(0)

Urban Backgrounds

In the Initial information form, a question concerning where the enrollee had lived most of the time up to the age of 16 followed questions concerning the length of time lived in the site city and present neighborhood. This question was often left unanswered, the interviewer evidently considering it to be evident that these predominantly long-term city residents had lived "most of the time" in the site city.

Non-urban backgrounds were reported for eight male, and for 18 female, subjects; and small city backgrounds were reported for eight Cincinnati and St. Louis subjects while large city backgrounds were reported for three Durham and East St. Louis subjects. Expressed as percentages of subjects reported in Table 3.4, nine percent of the subjects were reported to have spent most of their first 16 years in places different in size from their present urban locations (see Table 3.8). About six percent of the subjects were reported to have grown up in suburbs, small towns, rural non-farm locations, or on farms. The rest of the subjects who had not spent most of their first 16 years in their respective site cities could be inferred to have grown up in urban locations similar to those of their site cities.

All of the subjects who had been in their site cities five years or less (16 percent of the male subjects, and 12 percent of the female subjects) obviously spent most of their first 16 years outside the site cities, as did some of the subjects who had been in their site cities six to ten years. Study results indicated that most of these subjects who had grown up outside their cities had grown up in urban surroundings since suburban, town, or country backgrounds were reported by only six percent of the subjects.

TABLE 3.8

URBAN BACKGROUNDS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Background Dissimilar to Site City	Male N=144	Female N=304
	Percent	
Lived most of first 16 years:		
In large city (Durham & E.St.Louis)	1%	0%
In small city (Cin'ti. & St. Louis)	2	2
In a suburb	1	1
In a small town	4	4
In the country but not on a farm	1	1
On a farm	0	1
TOTAL[a]	9%	9%

[a] Percent of subjects reported in Table 3.4

Education at the Time of NYC Enrollment

The school grades completed by subjects in the Prospective Study at the time of NYC enrollment indicated varying needs for remedial education. About three-fifths of the male subjects, and two-fifths of the female subjects, had no better than ninth grade educations when they enrolled (see Table 3.9). The meager schooling of these subjects implied remedial education needs quite different from those of the better-educated enrollees--about one-fifth of the male subjects, and one-third of the female subjects--who had completed at least eleven school grades. The needs of the better-educated enrollees might be adequately met through the educational resources of the school systems in the site cities--the standard remedial education resources of the out-of-school NYC programs.

These enrollees might benefit from brush-up courses available through Adult Education programs or achieve high school graduation or equivalency through standard courses. The needs of the poorer-educated enrollees, on the other hand, were so extensive as to make the goal of high school graduation or equivalency unrealistic for most of them and to suggest the need for special efforts with respect to remedial education.

TABLE 3.9

HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Highest School Grade	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
6, or less	5%	1%
7-8	29	18
9	24	21
10	24	25
11	15	19
12	3	15
TOTAL	100%	99%
Mean highest school grade completed	9.2	9.9
Unknown (number)	(1)	(4)

Gross remedial education needs were greatest in Durham where 73 percent of the male subjects, and 53 percent of the female subjects had not gone beyond ninth grade (see Table 3.10). In contrast, in East St. Louis, only 41 percent of the male subjects and 22 percent of the female subjects, enrolled in the NYC with this little schooling. While the schooling of enrollees varied between sites, substantial proportions of enrollees in each site had not gone beyond ninth grade; and, in each site, male subjects were far more apt than female subjects to be in this category of meager schooling and extensive need for remedial education.

TABLE 3.10

HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE COMPLETED AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT,
PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
BY SEX AND SITE

Highest School Grade	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
		Percent		
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
9 grades or less	60%	73%	41%	59%
10-11	31	24	59	40
12	10	3	0	0
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	99%
Mean highest school grade completed	9.4	8.7	9.6	8.9
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
9 grades or less	33%	53%	22%	47%
10-11	30	35	75	49
12	37	11	4	4
TOTAL	100%	99%	101%	100%
Mean highest school grade completed	10.4	9.3	10.2	9.6
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(1)

Reasons for Leaving School

Most commonly, male subjects were reported to have left school for disciplinary reasons (34 percent), while female subjects were most commonly reported (42 percent) to have left school for reasons of health or pregnancy (see Table 3.11). The principal reason for leaving school for male subjects thus connoted acute maladjustment to school, while the principal reasons for female subjects emphasized circumstances outside of school. Another reason indicating maladjustment to school (left school for academic reasons) was significantly more often reported for male subjects (12 percent) than for female subjects (four percent). A third reason for leaving school, quit or lost interest, suggested rejection of school by study subjects and was about equally prevalent among male (16 percent) and female (19 percent) subjects.

TABLE 3.11

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Reasons	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
Academic	12%	4%
Economic	31	13
Discipline	34	6
Health	1	16
Pregnancy, marriage	0	26
rmy	1	0
Quit, lost interest	16	19
Graduation	4	16
TOTAL	99%	101%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(5)

The reasons that study subjects gave for leaving school probably reflected selections of "good" reasons to some extent; that is, a subject might consider "economic" reasons (needing or wanting to earn money) better than "academic" reasons (poor performance in school subjects) and emphasize the former. Except in instances in which the reasons indicated compulsory separations from school (expulsion or pregnancy), the subjects' exits from school connoted the exercise of options with the subject opting out of school. Reasons for leaving school thus generally indicated very widespread maladjustment to school among male subjects with at least six out of ten indicating rejection of or by school (academic, discipline, and lost interest reasons). Very significantly fewer female subjects indicated such maladjustment.

In each of the sites (see Table 3.12) substantially similar situations were apparent with respect to reasons for leaving school. From half to three-fourths of the male subjects, depending on the site, provided reasons that clearly connoted maladjustment to school (academic, discipline, or lost interest) while, among female subjects, the comparable proportions were about half (ranging from one-fifth to one-third). In Durham, the site in which subjects had the most severe educational deficiencies in terms of school grades completed, 61 percent of the male subjects and 30 percent of the female subjects gave such reasons for leaving school. Results such as these indicated that remedial education provisions involving conventional school-like classes would often meet with little success because achievement goals within the school system (the gaining of school credits, diplomas, or high school equivalency) were too high to be realistic and because of the rejection of the school system generally.

TABLE 3.12

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Reasons	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
		Percent		
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
Academic	5%	11%	8%	23%
Economic	36	36	24	30
Discipline	31	25	46	34
Health	0	0	0	5
Quit, lost interest, Army	19	25	22	7
Graduation	10	4	0	2
TOTAL	101%	101%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(1)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
Academic	2%	4%	0%	7%
Economic	12	17	7	12
Discipline	1	5	11	9
Health, pregnancy, marriage	31	42	54	47
Quit, lost interest	18	21	20	18
Graduation	36	11	4	6
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(4)	(0)	(0)

To the extent that "economic" reasons reflected opting out of schooling, the proportions of subjects who were maladjusted to school systems was even higher. Reasons for leaving school, together with grade levels of schooling completed, thus indicated widespread and urgent needs for innovative remedial education components in the NYC programs studied. These needs were particularly apparent in connection with male subjects.

Vocational Training or Preparation

At the time of their enrollment in the NYC approximately two-fifths of the subjects in the Prospective study reported that they had had some specific training or preparation for the world of work (see Table 3.13). Most of this preparation had occurred in high school, with the greater high school experience of female subjects resulting in comparatively more vocational preparation.

TABLE 3.13

VOCATIONAL TRAINING OR PREPARATION OTHER THAN NYC TRAINING PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Vocational Training	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
High School	22%	34%
Adult Education	1	1
Business School	0	1
Trade School	4	1
MDTA	0	1
Job Corps	4	0
OJT	0	0
Armed Forces	1	0
Other[a]	2	2
No Vocational Training	67	59
TOTAL	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(21)	(11)

---

[a] Includes community training programs (e.g., PEPSY in Cincinnati), training in correctional institutions, training through correspondence courses, and other miscellaneous training sources.

In general, the proportions of subjects reporting some vocational preparation in high school corresponded with the proportions of subjects reporting completion of at least the 11th grade: 18 percent of the male subjects, for example, completed 11th or 12th grade (see Table 3.9), and 22 percent reported high school vocational preparation; while, among female subjects, 34 percent completed 11th or 12th grade and 34 percent reported high school vocational preparation. These results suggested that leaving school before completing the 11th grade virtually closed the door on the chance of getting any vocational preparation in high school. Negligible proportions of subjects, furthermore, gained any vocational preparation in Adult Education courses conducted by public school systems. Other systems that might provide vocational preparation--notably, the Armed Forces and Federal manpower programs--had involved these young people to a very slight extent.

Compared to study subjects in other sites, East St. Louis subjects were very significantly more apt to have gone beyond 10th grade and to have achieved some vocational preparation prior to NYC enrollment. The more extensive vocational preparations of subjects in East St. Louis were, of course, patently ineffective in that all of these subjects were unemployed at the time of their 1966 NYC enrollments. The results indicated extraordinary employment problems in this site, suggesting that youth who would be able to obtain employment in other cities needed NYC assistance in East St. Louis.

Comparisons of the proportions of subjects who reported some vocational preparation in high school with the proportions of subjects who had completed 11th or 12th grade (see Table 3.10) indicated that the various school systems differed with respect to grade levels at which vocational education might be provided. Even though only 18 percent of the male subjects in East St. Louis, for example, had completed 11th grade and none had completed 12th grade, 47 percent of these subjects reported vocational preparation in high school. The proportions of female subjects in Cincinnati and East St. Louis and of male subjects in Durham who had completed 11th or 12th grade were closely similar to comparable proportions of reported vocational preparation in high school. In St. Louis, on the other hand, the proportion of subjects reporting vocational education in high school was less than the proportion reporting completion of 11th or 12th grades.

Elapsed Time Between Leaving School and Enrolling in NYC

At the time of their enrollment in the NYC, a little more than half of the subjects in the Experimental group of the Prospective study had been out of school one year or less (see Table 3.15). Male subjects were about twice as apt as female subjects (41 percent as compared with 22 percent) to have enrolled in the NYC within six months of leaving school. Female subjects, however, were about twice as apt as male subjects (24 percent as compared with 13 percent) to have enrolled in the NYC in the second post-dropout year, while approximately the same proportions of both male and female subjects had been out of school more than two years when they enrolled.

TABLE 3.15

MONTHS OUT OF SCHOOL AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX

Months	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
0-6	41%	22%
7-12	28	33
13-18	5	13
19-24	8	11
25-30	3	7
31-36	10	6
37 months or more	5	7
TOTAL	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(11)	(14)

The apparent tendency of the NYC programs studied to pick up male dropouts within a year of their leaving school was particularly apparent in Cincinnati, where 71 percent of the male subjects had been out of school one year or less when they enrolled (see Table 3.16). Compared to the other cities, furthermore, significantly fewer of the male subjects in Cincinnati (eight percent compared with 23 percent in the three other sites) had been out of school more than two years when they enrolled.

Compared to male subjects, female subjects were very significantly more apt to enroll in the NYC in the second year following school dropout. This delay among female subjects was apparent in each of the sites, and might be explained by circumstances associated with the principal reason for school dropout among these young women, in that pregnancy, childbirth, and infant care would tend to limit their activities. In any case, the proportions of male and female subjects enrolling in the NYC within two years of school dropout were closely similar in each site.

TABLE 3.16

MONTHS OUT OF SCHOOL AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Months	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
		Percent		
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
0-12	71%	68%	67%	62%
13-24	13	8	8	19
25-36	8	20	17	13
37 or more	0	4	8	7
TOTAL	102%	100%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(5)	(3)	(1)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
0-12	62%	43%	71%	49%
13-24	20	25	20	32
25-36	13	17	10	13
37 or more	4	16	0	7
TOTAL	99%	101%	101%	101%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(6)	(4)	(3)

Prior Job Experience

When they enrolled in the NYC, study subjects were asked a number of questions concerning their employment backgrounds: whether they had ever worked; if not, why not; if so, how they had found their most recent job and why they no longer had this job.

About one-fifth of the male, and two-fifths of the female, subjects reported that they had no employment experience (see Table 3.17). The difference between male and female subjects in this respect was apparent in each site except East St. Louis where approximately the same proportions of male and female subjects (33 percent and 36 percent, respectively) reported that they had never worked before. Approximately half of the subjects who had had no work experience prior to NYC had looked for jobs but either had not found any job or had not found a desirable job, while the other half had not--for one reason or another--been in the labor force (see Table 3.18).

TABLE 3.17

NO JOBS PRIOR TO NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male		Female	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Cincinnati	(42)	24%	(92)	47%
Durham	(30)	23	(85)	44
East St. Louis	(39)	33	(55)	36
St. Louis	(45)	11	(82)	37
All Sites	(156)	22%	(314)	41%

TABLE 3.18

REASONS FOR NO JOBS PRIOR TO NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Reasons	Male N=35	Female N=130
	Percent[a]	
Hunted, couldn't find a job	46%	35%
Couldn't find a desirable job	11	11
Didn't look for a job	32	33
Didn't look for a job, in school	7	13
Didn't need to work	4	6
Couldn't work	0	2
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(7)	(3)

[a] Percentages based on number of subjects reporting no job prior to NYC.

Male and female subjects with prior employment experience were similar with respect to their sources of "most help" in getting their last jobs (see Table 3.19). "Friends or relatives" were most frequently reported to have been the most help (31 percent and 35 percent, respectively). The personnel of schools and other institutions were also important sources of help in getting jobs--about one-fifth of the subjects reporting such sources. The Employment Service was reported to have been helpful by 12 percent of the male, and 19 percent of the female, subjects--slightly fewer than the number reporting that their last jobs were due to their own efforts (including answering ads and recommendations of previous employers).

TABLE 3.19

MOST HELP IN GETTING LAST JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX

Most Help	Male N=121	Female N=184
	Percent[a]	
State Employment Service	12%	19%
Private employment agency	0	2
School	10	7
Friends or relatives	31	35
Previous employer	2	3
Advertisements	5	5
Own efforts	20	15
Institutional personnel[b]	10	14
Other	0	1
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(6)	(1)

[a] Percent of subjects reporting job prior to NYC.

[b] Includes parole officer, welfare worker, training program staff member, and NAACP.

Subjects in St. Louis and East St. Louis were significantly more apt to report that the Employment Service had been of most help in getting their last jobs (see Table 3.20), in that 19 percent of the male subjects in these two sites reported this source of help (as compared with four percent of the subjects in Cincinnati and Durham) and in that 31 percent of the female subjects in these two sites (as compared with seven percent in Cincinnati and Durham) reported the Employment Service. Although reporting categories overlapped to some extent--"own efforts," for example, did not necessarily exclude other categories--these results indicated that the Employment Service had been found to be more useful by subjects in East St. Louis and St. Louis--particularly, St. Louis.

TABLE 3.20

MOST HELP IN GETTING LAST JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE[a]

Most Help	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
			Percent	
Male Subjects-Number	N=32	N=23	N=26	N=40
Employment Service	6%	0%	13%	23%
Friends or relatives	23	48	22	35
School, other institutional personnel	26	39	0	20
Other[b]	45	15	65	23
TOTAL	100%	102%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)
Female Subjects-Number	N=49	N=48	N=35	N=52
Employment Service	4%	10%	20%	38%
Friends or relatives	29	42	29	37
School, other institutional personnel	28	35	6	12
Other[b]	40	12	47	14
TOTAL	101%	99%	102%	101%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(1)

[a] Subjects with prior employment experience.

[b] Includes own efforts, advertisements, referrals by previous employers.

The Employment Service, schools, and personnel associated with such institutions as welfare or correctional departments could be considered as public or institutional sources of help in finding jobs. These sources of help together were reported to have been most helpful by from one-third to one-half of the subjects in the various site groups except in East St. Louis where other institutional sources were infrequently reported. The way to find a job in the several sites thus seemed to vary along several axes: systems of placement help were most in evidence in St. Louis where about half of the subjects reported help from the Employment Service or schools and other institutions; in Cincinnati and Durham, the Employment Service was a minor part of the systems picture, but schools and other institutions were somewhat more important than in St. Louis; and in East St. Louis, the systems of placement help (substantiall the Employment Service) were least in evidence. Less formalized ways of getting jobs (own efforts and the help of friends) were correspondingly most apparent in East St. Louis.

At the time of their enrollment in the NYC, all of the study subjects were unemployed. Most frequently, subjects who no longer had their most recent jobs reported that they had "quit" (see Table 3.21). Dissatisfactions with work were thus indicated by 46 percent of the male subjects, and by 43 percent of the female subjects, in three sites (information was very incomplete in the fourth site, East St. Louis). Dissatisfactions by employers with enrollees' work were indicated by subjects who reported that they had been fired from their jobs (12 percent of the male, and five percent of the female, subjects). Maladjustments to the world of work were thus suggested by the most recent job separations of about three-fifths of the male subjects, and half of the female subjects. In addition, a little more than one-fifth of the subjects reporting indicated that their last jobs had been temporary so that, on the basis of reasons given for no longer having last jobs, the major employability needs of NYC enrollees were associated with finding permanent jobs that could yield satisfactions to the enrollee and in which the enrollee could give satisfaction to his employer.

TABLE 3.21

REASONS NO LONGER HAVE MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE[a]

Reasons	Cin'ti.	Durham	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects-Number Reporting	N=32	N=23	N=40	N=91
Job ended	34%	6%	30%	27%
Quit	38	71	43	46
Was fired	9	12	15	12
Personal problems[b]	16	6	5	9
Other[c]	3	6	8	6
TOTAL	100%	101%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(5)	(0)	(5)
Female Subjects-Number Reporting	N=49	N=48	N=50	N=147
Job ended	29%	13%	20%	21%
Quit	38	34	54	43
Was fired	4	8	4	5
Personal problems[b]	16	32	18	21
Other[c]	13	13	4	10
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(10)	(0)	(14)

[a] Reasons of subjects with job experience prior to NYC enrollment. East St. Louis not reported because information was too incomplete.

[b] Includes reasons of health, including pregnancy, family reasons or problems such as marriage or baby-sitting, and moved.

[c] Returned to school, referred to NYC.

Help in finding a job could be a major factor in enhance adjustments to the world of work--about one-fifth of the male subjects, and two-fifths of the female subjects, had never held a job although half of these subjects had hunted for work without success. At the same time, even the subjects who had succeeded in finding jobs had not found jobs that they were able (or wanted) to keep. Employability needs as such, rather than needs for help in finding jobs, thus seemed to characterize study subjects.

Work Ability at Time of NYC Enrollment

When they enrolled in the NYC subjects were asked, "What kind of work can you do now?" Responses to this question tended to be incomplete with no information being supplied for 44 percent of the male subjects and for 52 percent of the female subjects. It is possible that interviewers left this question unanswered when the enrollee failed to indicate that he could do any kind of work, and that "unknown" in this instance represents "none" to some extent. In any case, the large number of "unknown's" in response to this question have been reflected in the percentage distributions shown in Table 3.22 in order to emphasize the partiality of reported vocational ability at the time of NYC enrollment.

About half of the subjects reported that they considered themselves able to do some kind of work, and about one-fourth of the subjects reported ability to do work above the unskilled level. The responses reported in Table 3.22 reflected the two metropolitan sites--Cincinnati and St. Louis--to a large extent (see Table 3.23). In these two larger sites, approximately one-third of the subjects--both male and female--considered themselves able to do work above the unskilled level of such jobs as maintenance work or baby-sitting. Most commonly, "semi-skilled" work among male subjects connoted factory or manual work while, among female subjects, it most commonly connoted clerical work. Some of the subjects described ability to do work that sounded like NYC jobs ("aide" work)--these subjects might have responded to this question in terms of what NYC work they were able to do

TABLE 3.22

KINDS OF WORK ABILITY AT THE TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT
PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
BY SEX

What work can you do now?	Male N=156	Female N=314
Work ability reported:		
	Percent	
Office clerical file, type, operate office machines, receptionist, cashier	3%	20%
Other non-manual "white collar" sales clerk, shipping clerk, production clerk, aide work	4	2
Craft, trade, technical lab technician, sign maker, mechanic's helper, auto mechanic, drummer	9	1
Machine operator or driver visual aid machine, tape machine, gold leaf stamper	1	0
Factory or assembly work packing and press operations	2	1
Service selling papers, janitor, dry cleaning, laundress, general maintenance, wash dishes, domestic, landscaping, cafeteria work, gas station attendant, laborer, baby sitter, clothes presser, food service	31	19
Sub-total, working ability reported	50%	45%
Work ability not reported:		
"Can't do any work right now" and "don't know"	5%	4%
No report	44	52
TOTAL	99%	101%

TABLE 3.23

KINDS OF WORK ABILITY AT THE TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

What kind of work can you do now?	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
Semi-skilled[a]	33%	0%	10%	27%
Unskilled	29	20	7	62
None	12	7	0	2
No report	26	73	82	9
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	100%
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
Semi-skilled[a]	34%	5%	24%	34%
Unskilled	16	2	11	46
None	4	1	4	9
No report	46	92	62	11
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%

[a] Work categories other than unskilled. See Table 3.22 for descriptions.

In Cincinnati and St. Louis, the two sites providing most complete reports concerning the subjects' work abilities at the time of NYC enrollment, the proportions of subjects who felt able to perform some kind of work seemed to derive from employment experience more than from vocational preparation. This was particularly evident with male subjects in that considerably more of them reported ability to do some kind of work than reported any vocational preparation or training. Female subjects in St. Louis, also, had clearly gained most of their performance skills through experience although--in this instance--subjects also apparently counted preparations as well as experience to some extent (see Table 3.24).

TABLE 3.24

COMPARISONS OF VOCATIONAL PREPARATION, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, AND ABILITY TO PERFORM IN A JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX

	Male		Female	
	Cin'ti.	St. Louis	Cin'ti.	St. Louis
		Percent		
Vocational preparation reported	36%	36%	56%	25%
Employment experience reported	76%	89%	53%	63%
Ability to work reported	62%	89%	50%	80%

Subjects who indicated that they were able to do some kind of work were also asked, "How well can you do it?" In the two sites where reports of kind of work were fairly frequent--Cincinnati and St. Louis--Cincinnati subjects were more apt to indicate above average ability; and, in both sites, male subjects were somewhat less apt than female subjects to indicate below-average ability (see Table 3.25). These results may have reflected abilities arising from successful experience among the generally older Cincinnati subjects, and among male subjects who--compared to female subjects--were more apt to have had working experience.

TABLE 3.25

LEVELS OF WORK ABILITY, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP IN CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS,[a] BY SEX

How well can you do it?	Male		Female	
	Cin'ti. N=26	St. Louis N=40	Cin'ti. N=46	St. Louis N=66
		Percent		
Very well, above average	44%	5%	35%	2%
OK, about average	48	85	45	80
Below average	8	10	18	19
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	101%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(0)	(2)	(2)

[a] Subjects reporting ability to do some kind of work.

Households at the Time of NYC Enrollment

In 1966 when they enrolled in the NYC, most of the study subjects were living in parental family units (see Table 3.26); that is, families headed by their fathers or mothers. Compared to male subjects, significantly more female subjects, however, had moved away from parental dependence and either were living alone or with spouses. Very few of the generally younger male subjects had moved towards independence in this way, and the family units of male subjects thus represented family circumstances in which the enrollees grew up to a large extent. Among the male subjects, 43 percent were living in two-parent families, 35 percent were living in families that lacked a male head (mother only), and 19 percent were living in family units that differed from "standard" families in some respects--father only families, foster homes, or with guardians or relatives.

TABLE 3.26

HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Subject lives with:	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
Both parents	43%	24%
Father only	2	2
Mother only	35	39
Guardian	1	2
Spouse	1	13
Alone	2	10
Other	16	11
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(3)

Among male subjects, family units at the time of NYC enrollment indicated dependency on parental families in each site (see Table 3.27), with non-standard family units being most frequently reported in East St. Louis. Only one-third of the male subjects in this site were living in two-parent families; whereas, in contrast, 55 percent of the male subjects in Durham were living in two-parent families at the time of enrollment.

Among female subjects, site study groups showed considerable variation with respect to family unit at the time of NYC enrollment. Although approximately three out of five subjects in each site were living in families headed by one or both parents, the proportion of mother-only family units was much larger in St. Louis (52 percent) than in the other sites. In Cincinnati, on the other hand, comparatively more subjects were living in father-headed family units and only 29 percent were living in mother-only families.

TABLE 3.27

HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Household	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
Father-headed household[a]	46%	55%	33%	46%
Mother-only	39	28	38	33
Self-headed household, married	0	0	5	0
Lives alone	2	3	0	2
Other	12	14	23	18
TOTAL	99%	100%	99%	99%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=82	N=55	N=82
Father-headed household[a]	34%	25%	22%	18%
Mother-only	29	37	38	52
Spouse-headed household, married	11	18	13	11
Lives alone	12	4	16	7
Other	14	16	11	10
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(0)

[a] Includes two-parent and father-only family units.

Marital Status at the Time of NYC Enrollment

As might be expected from the fact that most of them were living in parental family units, almost all of the male subjects reported that they were single (see Table 3.28). About one female subject in five, on the other hand, reported that she was or had been married. The proportions of female subjects who were, or had been, married were highest in Durham and East St. Louis (see Table 3.29).

TABLE 3.28

MARITAL STATUS AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Marital Status	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
Single, never married	97%	79%
Married, living with spouse	3	18
Separated, divorced	0	4
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(3)

TABLE 3.29

MARITAL STATUS AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY FEMALE SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE

Marital Status	Cin'ti. N=92	Durham N=82	East St. Louis N=55	St. Louis N=82
		Percent		
Single, never married	86%	70%	75%	83%
Married, living with spouse	14	24	20	13
Separated, divorced	0	6	5	4
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(0)

Own Children in Household at the Time of NYC Enrollment

Almost none of the male subjects, as compared with 55 percent of the female subjects, were living in households that contained children of their own (see Table 3.30). Own children in household were most frequently reported in East St. Louis (see Table 3.31) where 75 percent of the female subjects had children of their own. About three-fifths of the female subjects in Durham and St. Louis, and about two-fifths of the female subjects in Cincinnati, also, were living in households that contained children of their own. Obviously most of these young mothers were unmarried and were in family situations that--on the one hand--might increase their interest in work and work-training; but--on the other hand--might limit their time for such activities.

TABLE 3.30

OWN CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Own Children in Household	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
None	98%	45%
One	1	39
Two	1	14
Three	0	2
Four, five	0	1
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(8)	(5)

TABLE 3.31

OWN CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY FEMALE SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE

Own Children in Household	Cin'ti. N=92	Durham N=82	East St. Louis N=55	St. Louis N=82
		Percent		
None	60%	44%	25%	41%
One	32	39	45	41
Two	7	15	22	15
Three-five	1	2	7	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	99%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(3)	(0)	(0)

Annual Family Income

Most of the enrollees who became subjects in the Prospective study estimated that the annual incomes of their families in the year preceding enrollment were less than $5,000 (see Table 3.32). The median estimated annual family income among male subjects was slightly higher ($2,582) than that among female subjects ($2,460). The higher estimates of male subjects derived from higher estimates in East St. Louis and St. Louis (see Table 3.33) where the median estimated incomes of the families of male subjects were $861 and $393 higher, respectively, than comparable medians for female subjects. In the other two sites, the median family incomes of male subjects were slightly lower than those of female subjects.

TABLE 3.32

ESTIMATED ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Annual Family Income	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
Under $1,000	8%	8%
$1,000-$1,999	22	23
$2,000-$2,999	34	42
$3,000-$3,999	18	21
$4,000-$4,999	11	3
$5,000-$5,999	4	3
$6,000-$6,999	1	0
$7,000-$7,999	1	0
TOTAL	99%	100%
Median income (dollars)	$2,582	$2,460
Unknown (number)	(13)	(14)

TABLE 3.33

ESTIMATED ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Annual Family Income	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=44
Under $1,000	2%	10%	11%	11%
$1,000-$1,999	21	17	26	23
$2,000-$2,999	45	43	33	18
$3,000-$3,999	19	13	15	23
$4,000, or more	12	16	15	25
TOTAL	99%	99%	100%	100%
Median income (dollars)	$2,579	$2,163	$2,388	$2,875
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(12)	(1)
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
Under $1,000	4%	6%	9%	11%
$1,000-$1,999	8	33	38	23
$2,000-$2,999	54	37	40	34
$3,000-$3,999	27	18	11	21
$4,000, or more	6	5	2	11
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%
Median income (dollars)	$2,630	$2,274	$2,083	$2,482
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(10)	(2)

Size of Family

The size of the families of study subjects--the persons dependent on the estimated family incomes--averaged six persons (see Table 3.34). According to the poverty guidelines used by the NYC, incomes of $4,135, or less, would qualify individuals from families of this size for enrollment in the NYC.

Considered in conjunction with estimated annual family incomes, the number of persons dependent on these incomes thus indicated that poverty guidelines were more than met by the study subjects.[1]

TABLE 3.34

SIZE OF FAMILY AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT,[a] PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Number of Persons	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
1-5	53%	52%
6-10	37	39
11-15	10	9
TOTAL	100%	100%
Mean number of persons	6.0	5.8
Unknown (number)	(0)	(7)

[a] Persons dependent on family income

In the several sites, also, the number of persons dependent on family incomes (see Table 3.35), considered in conjunction with family incomes, indicated that study subjects fell well within poverty criteria. Although the estimates of family income by young family members might not be as accurate as those by breadwinners, it was of interest that enrollees' estimates of family income were fairly consistent. Incomes estimated by both male and female subjects, for example, were lower in Durham and East St. Louis than they were in the other two sites. The higher proportion of second-generation mother-only families in East St. Louis, furthermore, was consistent with the lowest median annual income of female subjects' families being in this site.

---

[1] NYC Program Standard No. 1-65 (March 29, 1966) set eligibility criteria for the family sizes involved as follows: 5 person families, $3,685; 6 person families, $4,135; and 7 person families, $4,685.

TABLE 3.35

SIZE OF FAMILY AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT,[a] PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Number of Persons	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=44
1-5	50%	47%	64%	51%
6-10	40	50	31	31
11-15	10	3	5	18
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean number of persons	6.0	5.5	5.4	6.7
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
1-5	60%	48%	56%	44%
6-10	36	43	44	33
11-15	3	7	0	22
TOTAL	99%	98%	100%	99%
Mean number of persons	5.1	6.1	4.9	6.7
Unknown (number)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0)

[a] Persons dependent on family income.

Public Housing

At the time of NYC enrollment, 14 percent of the male, and 16 percent of the female, subjects were living in public housing (see Table 3.36). Durham subjects were less apt than subjects in other sites to be living in public housing; and, in East St. Louis, female subjects were more apt than male subjects to be living in public housing at the time of enrollment.

TABLE 3.36

LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Percent[a]	(N)	Percent[a]
Cincinnati	(41)	12%	(92)	17%
Durham	(29)	7	(82)	6
East St. Louis	(34)	6	(48)	17
St. Louis	(45)	27	(82)	26
All Sites	(149)	14%	(304)	16%

[a] Percent of subjects reported (N).

Welfare Assistance

Nearly two-fifths of the study subjects reported that their families were receiving welfare assistance at the time of NYC enrollment (see Table 3.37). Except in Cincinnati, female subjects reported such assistance more frequently than did male subjects; and welfare assistance was most frequently reported in East St. Louis where 53 percent of the male subjects and 69 percent of the female subjects reported this situation.

TABLE 3.37

FAMILY RECEIVING WELFARE AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Percent[a]	(N)	Percent[a]
Cincinnati	(42)	33%	(90)	22%
Durham	(28)	21	(81)	28
East St. Louis	(36)	53	(52)	69
St. Louis	(45)	33	(82)	44
All Sites	(151)	36%	(305)	38%

[a] Percent of subjects reported (N).

Occupational Goals

When they enrolled in the NYC, about three-fourths of the male subjects and nine out of ten of the female subjects identified "lifetime occupational goals" (see Table 3.38). Both male and female subjects named fairly standard professional or semi-professional goals to about the same extent (15 percent and 18 percent, respectively); and very few subjects of either sex identified goals in unskilled occupations (six percent and five percent, respectively). Between these two occupational limits--occupations needing the most and the least preparation--the occupational goals of study subjects differed sharply according to the sex of the subject: 40 percent of the male subjects had manual work goals (trades, crafts, and machine operation); while 40 percent of the female subjects had clerical work goals (clerical and data processing).

The general, sex-associated characteristics of occupational goal distributions, apparent in the composite study group, were less apparent in the site groups. In the two larger sites--Cincinnati and St. Louis--about the same proportions of male and female subjects identified occupational goals (see Table 3.39); and in Durham, female subjects were very significantly less apt to have clerical occupational goals than were female subjects in the other sites.

TABLE 3.38

LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Occupational Goal	Male N=156	Female N=314
	Percent	
Professional, Semi-professional, Entrepreneur Accountant, architect, artist, boxer, businessman, commercial design, draftsman, engineer, flyer, social worker, teacher, nurse	15%	18%
Clerical Cashier, bookkeeper, clerk, receptionist, office work, secretary, typist, operator of office machines	5	39
Data Processing Keypunch, IMB work, computer operator	1	1
Technician X-ray, lab work, other white collar	1	1
Skilled Manual Trades and Crafts Auto mechanic, beautician, barber, bricklayer, carpenter, electrician, painter, printer, seamstress, tailor, welder	37	4
Machine Operator Lathe operator, heavy equipment operator	3	0
Semi-skilled Work Practical nurse, airline hostess, nursery school assistant, recreation leader, dry cleaner, community worker, factory work, hospital work, protective services	8	19
Unskilled Work Service station, construction, maintenance, food service, army	6	5
General "success" goal--make money, get education	3	0
Non-occupational goal--get married, stop working	0	1
None, undecided	19	10
Unknown	3	2
TOTAL	101%	100%

TABLE 3.39

LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Occupational Goal	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Number	N=42	N=30	N=39	N=45
Professional	24%	7%	13%	16%
Clerical, Data Processing	2	0	8	11
Skilled Manual, Technician	47	27	31	42
Semi-Skilled, Machine Operator	12	10	5	13
Unskilled	7	10	3	4
None, don't know	7	43	34	13
Unknown	0	3	8	0
TOTAL	99%	100%	102%	99%
Female Subjects-Number	N=92	N=85	N=55	N=82
Professional	15%	11%	35%	17%
Clerical, Data Processing	50	22	47	41
Skilled Manual, Technician	6	6	4	1
Semi-Skilled, Machine Operator	16	26	7	24
Unskilled	8	8	2	1
None, don't know	4	24	2	13
Unknown	0	2	4	1
TOTAL	99%	99%	101%	98%

Occupational goals might be taken as indications of possible motivational strengths with respect to work-training in that individuals with goals above unskilled labor might be expected to be more interested in training than individuals without occupational goals or goals that could be achieved with little or no preparation. So considered, female subjects in East St. Louis might have had the strongest motivations: almost all of these subjects identified goals above the unskilled level, and 35 percent of them had high (professional, semi-professional) goals. Female subjects in Cincinnati and St. Louis were substantially similar, except that fewer of them had high goals and correspondingly more of them had goals in semi-skilled or machine operator work. Female subjects in Durham, however, were very significantly less apt to report goals or goals above unskilled work than female subjects in the other sites.

Male subjects in Durham and East St. Louis were very significantly less apt to possess the motivational strengths connoted by occupational goals above the unskilled level than were male subjects in Cincinnati and St. Louis.

While occupational goals that implied the need for preparation might be taken as indications of motivations for work training, the distance of some goals from the realities of NYC work training might tend to neutralize their motivational force. Professional goals, for example, as well as many specific craft or trade goals, could not be directly achieved through NYC training. While these goals might be related to NYC participation through the achievement of intermediate employability that, in turn, might enable the enrollee to further his lifetime career plans, many of them might not, realistically, be motivational with respect to NYC training. Some of the "higher" goals, also, might be ideal rather than real (for example, goals of architect or flyer in most cases would seem to be unrealistic) so that they indicated little with respect to actual goals in the world of work.

In order to get a reading on the reality of occupational goals, subjects were asked to estimate their chances of goal achievement. Responses were very incomplete in Durham and East St. Louis; but, in the two larger sites, most of the subjects who identified occupational goals also estimated their chances of achievement (see Table 3.40).

TABLE 3.40

CHANCES OF ACHIEVING LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOAL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX

Chances	Male Cin'ti. N=39	 St. Louis N=39	 Total[a] N=78	Female Cin'ti. N=88	 St. Louis N=70	 Total[a] N=158
1-Excellent	23%	0%	10%	20%	3%	11%
2-Reasonably good	63	63	66	64	61	63
3-Slight	13	29	22	16	26	21
4-Unlikely	0	3	1	0	10	5
TOTAL	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	99%
Mean chances	1.9	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.4	2.2
Unknown (number)	(9)	(1)	(10)	(38)	(8)	(42)

[a] Two-site total, subjects reporting occupational goals. Less than half of the subjects in Durham and East St. Louis who reported occupational goals also estimated their chances of achievement.

Most of the subjects in Cincinnati and St. Louis thought that their chances of achieving their lifetime occupational goals were "excellent" or "reasonably good;" but Cincinnati subjects were much more apt to rate their chances as "excellent." Valued on a 4-point scale /running from "1" (excellent) to "4" (unlikely)/, Cincinnati subjects averaged very significantly higher than St. Louis subjects. This difference between sites was not apparently associated with the character of occupational goal; but, rather, seemed to indicate a greater optimism among enrollees in Cincinnati.

The occupational goals of study subjects were also evaluated by initial interviewers who indicated whether they thought the goals were "reasonable" or too "low" or "unrealistically high." As with enrollees' estimates of goal achievement, results in East St. Louis were too fragmentary to warrant analysis. Durham results, however, were satisfactory in that interviewers evaluated 83 percent of the goals reported by male subjects and 100 percent of the goals reported by female subjects. Durham interviewers indicated that 21 percent of the goals of male subjects were inappropriate (seven percent too low, and 14 percent unrealistically high), while 34 percent of the goals of female subjects were inappropriate (five percent too low, and 29 percent unrealistically high).

In the two metropolitan sites--Cincinnati and St. Louis--interviewers' estimates of occupational goals (see Table 3.41) suggested that St. Louis subjects were more apt to have unrealistically high goals. This was particularly evident in the goals of St. Louis male subjects, 31 percent of which were deemed to be unrealistically high, and might have reflected the unrealistic expectations that this youngest study group had of the world of work. In any case, interviewers' estimates of goals, like those of enrollees, indicated some goals needed to be brought into line with reality before they could serve as sources of motivation for productive participation in the NYC. Most of the subjects who had occupational goals--around three out of four--however, had goals that both the enrollees and the interviewers thought could be achieved and thus might provide motivation for achievement in the NYC as well as in the world of work.

TABLE 3.41

INTERVIEWER ESTIMATES OF LIFETIME OCCUPATIONAL GOALS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, CINCINNATI AND ST. LOUIS, BY SEX

	Male			Female		
Estimate	Cin'ti. N=39	St. Louis N=39	Total[a] N=78	Cin'ti. N=88	St. Louis N=70	Total[a] N=158
Low	5%	5%	5%	11%	0%	6%
Reasonable	86	64	75	75	71	73
Unrealistically high	8	31	20	14	29	22
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(4)	(4)

[a] Two-site total, subjects reporting occupational goals.

Interviewers' Impressions

After they had interviewed study subjects, initial interviewers rated them on a number of scales designed to give "first impressions" of the new NYC enrollees. Each of the scales, defined by bi-polar adjectives, ran from "poor" (1) to "good" (5); that is, the higher the rating, the "better" the enrollee was in the rated area. Approximately 93 percent of the male, and 96 percent of the female, subjects were rated in this way.

Average ratings in the composite Experimental group showed little difference between male and female subjects (see Table 3.42) with respect to first impressions. Among male subjects, average ratings ranged from 3.1 to 3.8; and, among female subjects, averages ranged from 3.2 to 3.8. Among both male and female subjects, the lowest averages (3.1 or 3.2 for male subjects, and 3.2 or 3.3 for female subjects) occurred in the Timid-Confident scale and in the speech scales of Halting-Fluent and Ungrammatical-Grammatical. Male subjects also averaged 3.2 ratings in the Mumbles-Speaks Clearly and the

Awkward-Poised scales. Highest average ratings (3.7 or 3.8) occurred among both male and female subjects in the Hostile-Friendly and the Dirty-Clean scales, while female subjects also achieved highest ratings in the Unhealthy-Healthy Appearance and the Apathetic-Interested scales. The difference between lowest and highest average ratings were, statistically, very significant and indicated that study subjects had impressed their initial interviewers as being somewhat timid, but very friendly. Of the areas rated, those connected with speech were most apt to produce "poor" impressions with respect to clarity, fluency, and grammatical correctness.

TABLE 3.42

INTERVIEWERS' IMPRESSIONS OF ENROLLEES AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, MEAN RATINGS OF SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Impressions	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean[a]	(N)	Mean[a]
Appearance:				
Inappropriate/Appropriate Dress	(146)	3.4	(304)	3.6
Dirty/Clean	(145)	3.7	(302)	3.8
Unkempt/Neat	(146)	3.6	(304)	3.6
Poor/Good Posture	(146)	3.5	(304)	3.6
Unhealthy/Healthy Appearance	(146)	3.6	(304)	3.8
Awkward/Poised	(145)	3.2	(303)	3.4
Speech:				
Mumbles/Speaks Clearly	(145)	3.2	(303)	3.4
Halting/Fluent	(144)	3.2	(301)	3.3
Ungrammatical/Grammatical	(145)	3.1	(302)	3.3
Unpleasant/Pleasant Voice	(145)	3.5	(300)	3.6
Attitude:				
Hostile/Friendly	(145)	3.8	(303)	3.8
Apathetic/Interested	(145)	3.6	(302)	3.7
Timid/Confident	(145)	3.1	(303)	3.2

[a] Mean of subjects rated (N) on a 5-point scale running from poor ("1") to good ("5") in the various areas; for example, in dress, from inappropriate ("1") to appropriate ("5").

The ratings of subjects in the composite Experimental group, shown in Table 3.42, reflected different site situations--different subjects and different interviewers. Differences between sites with respect to first impressions might thus reflect the rater as much as the ratee. Within sites, however, the interviewer contribution to ratings was more controlled so that differences in average ratings tended to reflect study subjects.

Although the range of average ratings indicated substantial differences between sites (see Table 3.43), high and low averages tended to support the impressions produced by the composite averages: healthy looking, friendly and interested, but timid, young people whose speech was sometimes faulty. Average ratings were highest in Cincinnati, ranging among male subjects from the low of 3.1 (Timid-Confident, Awkward-Poised) to the high of 4.4 (Hostile-Friendly), and, among female subjects, from the low of 3.7 (Timid-Confident) to the high of 4.7 (Dirty-Clean and Apathetic-Interested). Average ratings were lowest in Durham where, among male subjects, averages ranged from 2.7 (Ungrammatical-Grammatical Speech) to 3.5 (Hostile-Friendly), and among female subjects, from 2.7 (Mumbles-Speaks Clearly and Ungrammatical-Grammatical) to 3.2 (Hostile-Friendly). The lower Durham averages with respect to speech ratings were consistent with the lower educational levels of Durham subjects, but the generally lower character of Durham averages suggested interviewer contribution (in Durham, an Employment Service worker) as well as subject characteristics. The "poorer" impressions made by Durham and St. Louis subjects may thus have been illusory to some extent.

TABLE 3.43

INTERVIEWERS' IMPRESSIONS OF ENROLLEES AT TIME OF NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, MEAN RATINGS OF SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Impressions	Cin'ti.	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects-Percent Reporting[a]	100%	93%	78%	100%
Appearance:				
Inappropriate/Appropriate Dress	3.6	3.2	3.7	3.1
Dirty/Clean	4.2	3.3	3.9	3.2
Unkempt/Neat	4.2	3.4	3.7	3.1
Poor/Good Posture	3.8	3.1	3.8	3.3
Unhealthy/Healthy Looking	4.0	3.3	4.2	3.2
Awkward/Poised	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.2
Speech:				
Mumbles/Speaks Clearly	3.5	2.8	3.7	2.8
Halting/Fluent	3.4	2.9	3.6	2.8
Ungrammatical/Grammatical	3.4	2.7	3.5	2.9
Unpleasant/Pleasant Voice	3.7	3.1	3.9	3.2
Attitude:				
Hostile/Friendly	4.4	3.5	4.0	3.3
Apathetic/Interested	4.1	3.3	3.9	3.2
Timid/Confident	3.1	2.9	3.7	2.9
Female Subjects-Percent Reporting[a]	100%	100%	84%	98%
Appearance:				
Inappropriate/Appropriate Dress	4.3	2.9	4.0	3.2
Dirty/Clean	4.7	3.1	4.2	3.3
Unkempt/Neat	4.5	2.8	4.1	3.3
Poor/Good Posture	4.3	2.9	3.9	3.3
Unhealthy/Healthy Looking	4.5	3.1	4.2	3.3
Awkward/Poised	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.1
Speech:				
Mumbles/Speaks Clearly	4.1	2.7	3.7	3.0
Halting/Fluent	4.0	2.8	3.4	2.9
Ungrammatical/Grammatical	4.0	2.7	3.4	3.1
Unpleasant/Pleasant Voice	4.2	3.1	4.0	3.1
Attitude:				
Hostile/Friendly	4.6	3.2	4.2	3.3
Apathetic/Interested	4.7	2.9	4.1	3.1
Timid/Confident	3.7	2.8	3.6	2.9

[a] All responses as percent of all possible responses (number of subjects multiplied by number of items). Mean ratings on 5-point scale running from poor ("1") to good ("5") in the various areas; for example, in dress, from inappropriate ("1") to appropriate ("5").

In one site, Cincinnati, female subjects made significantly better impressions than did male subjects. The average rating of female Cincinnati subjects were higher than the comparable averages of male subjects in each scale and in all except two scales (Unkempt-Neat and Hostile-Friendly) the differences were significant at the .01 Confidence Level. In the other sites there were no statistically significant differences between male and female subjects with respect to average ratings. It was of interest, however, that in Durham the average ratings of female subjects were equaled or exceeded by those of the male subjects in every scale. In East St. Louis and St. Louis, on the other hand, female subjects tended to produce higher (although not significantly higher) averages than male subjects in the respective scales.

Interviewers' Observation of Physical Handicaps

Interviewers were asked to record the presence of observable physical handicaps or defects. These observations included such defects or handicaps as "poor eyesight," "speech defect," "grossly overweight," and losses or impairments of limbs. Most of the study subjects had no such observable defects, but handicaps of varying gravity were reported for nine percent of the male, and four percent of the female, subjects (see Table 3.44). It was of interest that handicapped male subjects were more frequently reported in Cincinnati and Durham. Compared to female subjects in these two sites, significantly more males elicited observations of physical handicaps or defects (13 percent as compared with four percent). These results indicated that the Cincinnati and Durham programs were enrolling young men whose employability problems were exacerbated by physical handicaps to perhaps a greater extent than the other two programs studied, but the lay character of the observations suggests caution in the interpretation of these results.

TABLE 3.44

INTERVIEWERS' OBSERVATIONS OF PHYSICAL HANDICAPS OR DEFECTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Percent[a]	(N)	Percent[a]
Cincinnati	(40)	13%	(91)	4%
Durham	(28)	14	(85)	4
East St. Louis	(22)	5	(42)	2
St. Louis	(41)	5	(76)	4
All Sites	(131)	9%	(294)	4%

[a] Percent of all subject reported (N).

Follow-Up Information Concerning Enrollee Characteristics at the Time of Enrollment

Some of the information developed in follow-up interviews with subjects in the Experimental group pertained to characteristics at the time of NYC enrollment. These results with respect to reasons for leaving school and getting into the NYC, based on the interviewed part of the Experimental group, are reported below. Follow-up information also involved subjects in the Control group, so that these variables were of interest for the degree of match as well as for the additional information that they provided concerning the characteristics of enrollee-subjects.

Reasons for Leaving School

Although more detailed than comparable information derived from the Initial Interview Form, information concerning reasons for leaving school pointed to the same conclusions. Approximately half of the male study subjects interviewed in 1969 reported main reasons for leaving school that indicated direct rejection of or by the school environment (see Table 3.45). Among male subjects in the Experimental study group, 37 percent indicated that they had opted out of school primarily because of the quality of their school experience--they weren't "learning anything," they didn't "get along well" with teachers, or--most frequently--they "lost interest" in school. In addition, one-fifth of these subjects reported that they left because they had been suspended or expelled.

Approximately one-third of the male study subjects reported main reasons for leaving school that involved the desire or need to work and earn money. Although not directly reflecting the quality of their school experience, these main reasons also implied a rejection of school in favor of activities more relevant to the subjects' needs and interests.

Among female subjects interviewed in 1969 the single most important reason for leaving school--reported by a little more than two-fifths of these subjects--was pregnancy. As with the male subjects, loss of interest in school, a preference for work, and a desire to earn money for personal expenses were important main reasons among female subjects for leaving school. Compared to male subjects, however, direct or indirect rejections of schooling figured far less prominently in their main reasons for leaving school.

TABLE 3.45

MAIN REASON FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Main Reason for Leaving School	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	Female Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
The School Environment				
Academic:				
Some subjects too difficult	2%	3%	1%	3%
Wasn't learning anything	2	1	-	0
Interpersonal or behavioral:				
Didn't get along well with teachers	11	15	2	4
Didn't get along well with students	2	3	0	0
Suspended or expelled	20	12	3	5
Other:				
Lost interest, quit	20	16	16	9
Sub-total, school	57%	50%	22%	21%
Outside Interests, Pressures, Conditions				
Employment, alternative activities:				
Would rather work than study	6%	16%	6%	2%
Needed money for clothes, etc.	13	3	5	4
Had to support wife	3	1	0	0
Had to help out my family, other family reasons	8	9	6	7
Wanted to enlist in Armed Forces	1	0	0	0
Wanted to enroll in Job Corps, other training	0	3	0	0
Other:				
Pregnancy	0	0	42	45
Health	0	3	1	3
Moved, school closed	1	0	0	1
Jailed	0	0	0	1
Sub-total, other	32%	35%	60%	63%
Other				
Graduated	9%	15%	18%	16%
Completed terminal education	2	0	-	0
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(1)

Since leaving school may often involve several "reasons"--"losing interest", for example, possibly being a joint factor with "preferring work"--study subjects were asked to report all of their reasons for leaving school as well as their main reasons. Male subjects were far more apt than female subjects to report several reasons for leaving school (see Table 3.46). Compared to main reasons, all of the reasons for leaving school reported by male subjects gave greater weight to reasons connoting maladjustment to the school environment, to the preference for work over study, and to the need to earn money for personal expenses. So far as reasons for leaving school were concerned, two-thirds of the female dropouts would, presumably, have continued in school if they had not become pregnant. Among male dropouts, on the other hand, reasons for leaving school indicated a complex of behavioral and situational characteristics that mutually reinforced dropping out.

TABLE 3.46

ALL REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Reasons for Leaving School	Male		Female	
	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=205	Con. N=138
The School Environment				
Academic:				
Some subjects too difficult	8%	7%	2%	5%
Wasn't learning anything	9	6	1	4
Interpersonal or behavioral:				
Didn't get along well with teachers	16	21	3	7
Didn't get along well with students	5	3	0	3
Suspended or expelled	27	16	4	7
Other:				
Lost interest, quit	38	25	20	15
Sub-total, School	103%	78%	30%	41%
Outside Interest, Pressures, Conditions				
Employment, alternative activities:				
Would rather work than study	19%	24%	7%	4%
Needed money for clothes, expenses	30	12	8	4
Had to support wife	3	1	0	0
Had to help out my family, other family reasons	14	10	9	7
Wanted to enlist in Armed Forces	6	4	0	1
Wanted to enroll in Job Corps, other training	0	3	0	0
Other:				
Pregnancy	0	0	42	46
Health	0	3	1	3
Moved, school closed	2	0	2	2
Jailed	0	1	0	1
Sub-total, Outside	74%	58%	69%	68%
Other				
Graduated	9%	15%	18%	16%
Completed terminal education	2	0	0	0
TOTAL[a]	188%	151%	117%	125%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(1)

---

[a] Subjects could give more than one reason.

Information Concerning the NYC

So far as academic and vocational preparations for the world of work were concerned, the principal difference between subjects in the comparative study groups was the NYC experience of subjects in the Experimental group. This experience will be more fully discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of this report. At this time, however, it seems appropriate to review information concerning the NYC and study groups in order to see whether inferences may be drawn concerning differences in study subjects associated with enrollment in the NYC.

Sources of Information

Almost all of the subjects in the Control study group had heard of the NYC, and they named various sources of NYC information with about the same frequency as did subjects in the Experimental group (see Table 3.47). Most of the study subjects, regardless of study sub-group, reported that they had heard of the NYC within the personal circle of their friends or family. Schools were the second most frequently reported sources of information concerning the program. These sources of information--friends, family, and school--were named by a little more than three-fourths of the subjects in each study sub-group. Some knowledge of the NYC thus appeared to be almost as much a part of the immediate world of subjects in the Control group as it was of subjects in the Experimental group.

TABLE 3.47

HOW HEARD ABOUT NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

How Heard	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	 Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
Private sources of information:				
Friends	48%	48%	50%	46%
Family, other relatives, family friends	8	12	17	16
Sub-total, Private	56%	60%	67%	62%
Public sources of information:				
Employment Service, Youth Opportunity Center	3%	10%	11%	6%
School	22	17	9	10
Neighborhood Center, poverty workers	9	3	7	5
Ads, announcement, signs[a]	7	8	5	15
Sub-total, Public	41%	38%	32%	36%
Public and private	3%	2%	1%	2%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown and never heard of NYC (number)	(0)	(9)	(0)	(6)

[a] Includes "just walking around".

Information Level (Control Group Subjects)

The knowledge that subjects in the Control group had of the NYC was outlined by a series of interview questions. After finding out whether the subject had ever heard of the NYC (95 percent of them had), the interviewer asked the subject if he would know where to go if he wanted to apply (about 60 percent of the subjects answered "yes"). At this point in the interview, the subject was asked to "tell me a little about what the NYC does and who it's for." On the basis of responses to this request, the interviewer rated the subject's knowledge of the program. Only about one-fifth of the subjects were rated by their interviewers as knowing "quite a bit" about the program.

The proportions of well-informed subjects in the Control group were surprisingly small in view of the proportions of those who reported that they had actually applied for NYC enrollment--31 percent of the male subjects, and 61 percent of the female subjects (see Table 3.48). As noted earlier, applications that did not eventuate in NYC enrollments were a source of subjects for the Control group. While this selection source tended to assure a match with subjects in the Experimental group so far as NYC eligibility was concerned, it is possible that some of these "no-shows" were less interested in and less well-informed about this work-training program [1] than were subjects who actually undertook NYC experience. By the same token, it is probable that many of the subjects who enrolled in the NYC knew relatively little about the program at the time of enrollment.

[1] Vagueness concerning the NYC was particularly marked among female subjects in the Control group, as indicated by their responses to knowing where to go, and actually applying, for enrollment in the NYC. Of 49 subjects who reported that they wouldn't know where to go to apply, for example, 19 also reported that they had actually applied.

TABLE 3.48

NYC INFORMATION LEVEL AND CONSIDERATION OF THE NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II CONTROL STUDY GROUP BY SEX

Level and Consideration	Male N=69	Female N=138
	Percent	
Information level:		
Knows quite a bit about the NYC	22%	18%
Knows only a little about the NYC	44	41
Is confused, unclear about the NYC	23	37
Has never heard of the NYC	11	4
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(7)
Consideration:		
Never heard of the NYC	11%	4%
Heard of the NYC:		
Never thought of applying	33	28
Thought of applying, but didn't apply	25	8
Applied for enrollment in the NYC	31	61
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(8)

Even though some of them knew relatively little about the NYC, about half of the subjects in the Control group reported that they had at some time applied for enrollment in the NYC. None of these subjects actually completed enrollment in the program, but their applications for enrollment indicated that they had considered the NYC to be relevant to their needs at one time. It was of interest that very significantly more female than male subjects in the Control group (61 percent, as compared with 31 percent) reported this degree of consideration for the program.

Compared to other categories of subjects in the Control group, white male subjects were least likely to have heard of the NYC (see Table 3.49). This result suggested that these white male subjects were outside the communications networks that informed other study subjects of this work-training opportunity. Whether the fact that one-third of the white male subjects in the Control group had never heard of the NYC connoted differences that would affect study results, however, cannot be determined on the basis of this fact alone. Similarly, the significant differences between male and female subjects in the Control group with respect to the extent that they considered the NYC relevant to themselves and applied for enrollment cannot definitely be associated with differences significant to the study design. From the point of view of program operations, however, these differences indicated that the extent and character of NYC information was comparatively ineffective in interesting disadvantaged young men--particularly disadvantaged white young men--in the program.

TABLE 3.49

CONSIDERATION OF THE NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II
CONTROL STUDY GROUP BY SEX AND RACE

Consideration	Male White N=20	Male Negro N=49	Female White N=20	Female Negro N=118
	Percent		Percent	
Never heard of the NYC	33%	2%	0%	4%
Heard of the NYC:				
Never thought of applying	28	35	29	27
Thought of applying but didn't apply	17	28	12	7
Applied for enrollment in the NYC	22	35	59	61
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(5)

Summary

The characteristics of subjects in the Experimental group of the Prospective study indicated a number of employability needs and suggested some constraints on program operations designed to meet these needs. Male subjects, for example, characteristically had comparatively little schooling and comparatively little vocational preparation. They tended to be younger than female subjects and were, most often, still dependent members of parental family units at the time of NYC enrollment. As future breadwinners, their needs to qualify for occupations above the unskilled level were crucial and included additional basic education as well as training in specific vocational skills. Their frequently poor experiences with schooling indicated that effective involvement in remedial education might require innovative NYC programming, while their freedom from family responsibilities of their own indicated that they could "afford" NYC experience.

Compared to male subjects, female subjects were apt to have gone further in school and to possess more vocational preparation. On the other hand, they were more apt to be involved in family responsibilities of their own, to have less time to devote to continued education and preparations for the world of work, and to have immediate needs for breadwinner jobs.

Enrollees in the various sites possessed these characteristics in varying degrees. The employability needs of female subjects in Cincinnati were, perhaps, less exigent than those of other study sub-groups in that these subjects were among the oldest, best-educated, least apt to have children, and least apt to be on relief at the time of NYC enrollment. Male subjects in Durham, on the other hand, represented, perhaps, the most extreme employability needs in terms of lack of schooling and vocational preparation. At the same time, subjects in East St. Louis albeit comparatively high average age, levels of education and of vocational preparation, had not achieved employability. These results indicated that the achievement of NYC objectives might require differing program emphases in the several sites.

IV

NYC Experience--Program Information

Information concerning the NYC experience of subjects in the Experimental group of the Prospective Study was sought from program sources during NYC enrollments as well as from the enrollee-subjects themselves in follow-up interviews. This chapter reports program-sourced information concerning the NYC experience of study subjects--the information supplied by the subjects' work supervisors and counselors. The information forms used in this part of the research consisted of Work Supervisor and Counselor evaluation forms--completed whenever an enrollee left an NYC work assignment, and a Termination Form--completed when an enrollee terminated from the NYC.[1] As with the initial information, discussed in the preceding chapter, this part of the research could not have been completed without the active cooperation of program personnel in the several sites.

Number of Enrollments

Most of the study subjects had a single NYC enrollment in the course of the Prospective study (see Table 4.1). Number of enrollments reflected the number of times that a subject's NYC experience was reported on a Termination Form, and this information, consequently, was unknown for the five subjects who were still active NYC enrollees at the time the study ended. Also unknown were the number of enrollments of nine subjects whose records did not include Termination Forms. Termination Forms were available, however, for 97 percent of the subjects and indicated that 82 percent of these subjects had a single NYC enrollment. Virtually all of the rest of the subjects with Termination Forms had NYC experience consisting of two enrollments.

---

[1] These forms constitute Appendices B, C, and D, respectively, of this report.

TABLE 4.1

NUMBER OF NYC ENROLLMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY ALL SUBJECTS

Number of Enrollments	Number	Percent
One enrollment	386	82%
Two enrollments	64	14
Three enrollments	6	1
Unknown (still enrolled)	5	1
Unknown (missing information)	9	2
TOTAL	470	100%

Most of the enrollees in the Prospective study had standard NYC experience consisting of work-training in one or more of the program's worksites plus educational and counseling inputs to varying extents. In Cincinnati, however, 27 subjects participated in a special skill training program--the Cincinnati Clerical Co-op. The format of NYC experience in the Co-op involved alternating periods of classroom work and of work experience in co-operating businesses; and the information forms designed for standard NYC experience, consequently, did not fit the experience of Co-op subjects. The Co-op became the subject of a special research unit in this study, and Co-op experience has been separately reported.[1] In the present report, the NYC experience of Co-op subjects has been reported when possible and appropriate.

Single NYC enrollments in the course of the Prospective study characterized both male and female subjects in each site (see Table 4.2).

TABLE 4.2

NUMBER OF NYC ENROLLMENTS,
PROSPECTIVE STUDY ALL TERMINATED SUBJECTS[a], BY SEX AND SITE

Number of Enrollments	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	42	30	39	45	156
One enrollment	30%	97%	92%	87%	88%
Two or three enrollments	20	3	8	13	12
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
In Co-op (number)	(1)				(1)
Missing information (number)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(2)
Female Subjects--Number	92	85	55	82	314
One enrollment	77%	83%	90%	86%	84%
Two or three enrollments	23	17	10	14	16
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
In Co-op (number)	(26)				(26)
Still enrolled (number)	(0)	(3)	(1)	(0)	(4)
Missing information (number)	(0)	(0)	(4)	(3)	(7)

[a] Subjects still enrolled, and Co-Op subjects excluded from percentage base.

---

[1] Reported in "The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op: A Formal Skill Training Program" (1969).

Length of NYC Experience

Program reports of calendar days in the NYC indicated that male subjects averaged 144 days while female subjects averaged 191 days (see Table 4.3). Assuming 30 days per month, average days in the NYC amounted to 4.8 and 6.4 months, respectively--much less than the lengths of NYC experience reported by study subjects. Program reports of the length of NYC experience were very much shorter than comparable enrollee reports except in Cincinnati where program reports of experience for male subjects averaged 5.6 months (as compared with enrollee reports of 6.0 months) and program reports of experience for female subjects averaged 9.2 months (as compared with enrollee reports of 10.2 months). The very much longer NYC experience reported by enrollees in the other sites, together with indications of incomplete reporting, suggested that program information may have under-reflected experience of more than six months.

In the first enrollment (see Table 4.4) 73 percent of the enrollments of male subjects and 63 percent of the enrollments of female subjects amounted to 180 claendar days or less. Even if all of the second enrollments (12 percent of the male subjects and 16 percent of the female subjects) were subtracted from the six months or less and added to more than six months categories of NYC experience, the program-reported proportion of NYC experience amounting to six months or less would still be larger than the comparable enrollee-reported proportion, (47 percent of the male subjects and 33 percent of the female subjects reported NYC experience of six months or less). Whether program information tended to under-reflect longer NYC experience, or whether enrollee information tended to over-report the length of NYC experience, however, program information indicated that most enrollees had a single enrollment, and that the first NYC enrollments in the Prospective study covered most of the NYC experience of study subjects (see Table 4.5).

In the composite Experimental study group the first NYC enrollments of significantly more male than female subjects covered 180 claendar days, or less (73 percent as compared with 63 percent). In Cincinnati the difference between male and female subjects in this respect was large enough to be very significant (71 percent as compared with 42 percent); but, in the other sites, the differences in the proportions of male and female subjects with first enrollments of 180 days or less were not statistically significant.

TABLE 4.3

MEAN LENGTH OF TIME IN THE NYC,
PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean[a]	(N)	Mean[a]
Cincinnati	(41)	169	(66)	275
Durham	(24)	87	(69)	141
East St. Louis	(33)	205	(41)	198
St. Louis	(44)	107	(78)	160
All Sites	(142)	144	(254)	191

[a] Calendar days in NYC for subjects reported (N).

TABLE 4.4

LENGTH OF FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Length (calendar days)	Male N=156	Female N=314
0-30	22%	13%
31-90	33	26
91-180	18	24
181-270	9	15
271-360	9	10
361-540	6	8
541-720	2	3
721-900	1	1
TOTAL	100%	100%
Mean length (days)	138	173
Not reported (number)		
Unknown, still in NYC	(0)	(4)
Unknown, Co-op termination[a]	(1)	(24)
Unknown, missing information	(13)	(32)

[a] Two female Co-op subjects terminated from standard NYC program before enrolling in Co-op.

TABLE 4.5

LENGTH OF FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Length (calendar days)	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number[a]	41	30	39	45
0-30	15%	38%	18%	23%
31-90	29	33	21	48
91-180	27	13	18	11
181-360	17	16	24	16
361-720	9	0	21	2
721-900	2	0	0	0
TOTAL	99%	100%	102%	100%
Mean length (days)	159	86	201	98
Unknown (number)	(0)	(6)	(6)	(1)
Female Subjects--Number[b]	68	82	54	82
0-30	8%	17%	5%	18%
31-90	14	33	14	29
91-180	20	28	36	23
181-360	24	10	7	12
361-720	19	1	19	10
721-900	2	1	2	0
TOTAL	102%	99%	100%	100%
Mean length (days)	247	130	182	144
Unknown (number)	(2)	(13)	(12)	(4)

---

[a] Number excludes one Cincinnati Co-op subject who had no standard NYC experience.

[b] Number excludes 24 Cincinnati Co-op subjects whose experience was reported on Co-op Termination Forms, and 4 subjects who had not terminated from first NYC enrollment.

Enrollments and Assignments

The design of the Prospective study contemplated the possibility of multiple enrollments and, within enrollments, of multiple work assignments. The data collection plan of the study provided for the completion of successive Termination Forms, as needed, for multiple enrollments, and for the completion, for multiple assignments, of successive Work Supervisor and Counselor reports (as needed). Data collection based on units of experience, rather than regular reporting intervals, proved to be difficult to supervise and resulted, in some instances, in missing information. Fifteen percent of the first work assignments reported as "first" by work supervisors and counselors, for example, were described as "second" assignments in Termination Forms. In order to make the best possible use of the program information produced in the Prospective study, it was decided to tabulate information concerning the first and last reported assignments in the first and last reported enrollments.

The bulk of NYC experience reported in the Prospective study (see Table 4.6) was reflected in results describing the first reported assignment in the first enrollment. Eighty-seven percent of all subjects had a single NYC enrollment in the course of the study, and 69 percent of all first enrollments (the only reported enrollment for nine out of ten subjects) involved a single reported work assignment. This "one-shot" aspect of most NYC experience suggested that re-enrollment and re-assignment were seldom-used techniques in developing enrollees' employability or in achieving better enrollee adjustments to NYC training.

TABLE 4.6

ENROLLMENTS AND WORK ASSIGNMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Enrollments and Assignments	Male	Female
First Enrollment--Number[a]	155	286
One work assignment	71%	67%
Two work assignments	18	23
Three or more work assignments	11	9
TOTAL	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(6)	(8)
Last Enrollment--Number	18	45
One work assignment	73%	79%
Two work assignments	13	14
Three or more work assignments	13	7
TOTAL	99%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(2)

---

[a] Co-op subjects without standard NYC experience excluded.

Length of Actual NYC Experience, First NYC Enrollment

In two of the sites--Cincinnati and St. Louis--a 32-hour NYC work week was in force throughout the Prospective study. In the other two sites, most of the enrollees worked less than 32 hours some of them were "part-time" (see Table 4.7). Most of the Durham subjects (67 percent of the male subjects, and 95 percent of the female subjects) were on a 25-hour NYC work week in their first NYC enrollment. In East St. Louis about 3 out of 10 subjects were on 25-hour NYC weeks. In each of the sites, a 4-day NYC work week was standard; but for most of the Durham subjects and for about 30 percent of the East St. Louis subjects the NYC work week was at least 22 percent shorter, in terms of hours, than the 32-hour work weeks of subjects in Cincinnati and St. Louis.

Comparison of days actually worked in the NYC (see Table 4.8) with calendar days in the program (see Table 4.4) indicated that some of the shorter first enrollments may have involved some absenteeism, particularly among female subjects. On the whole, however, there was general correspondence between days in the program and days actually worked (based on a 4-day work week) both in the composite and in the site results (see Table 4.9). The shorter work weeks in terms of hours in Durham, though, implied that the actual NYC experience of Durham subjects was even less than was indicated by the lower mean days actually worked in this site.

TABLE 4.7

AVERAGE HOURS WORKED PER WEEK, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Hours per Week	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
24 hours, or less	0%	0%	16%	0%
25 hours	0	67	15	0
26-31 hours	0	11	46	0
32 hours	100	22	23	100
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(12)	(26)	(0)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82
24 hours, or less	0%	2%	0%	0%
25 hours	0	93	28	0
26-31 hours	0	5	33	0
32 hours	100	0	39	100
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(26)	(36)	(0)

TABLE 4.8

DAYS ACTUALLY WORKED IN NYC, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Days worked	Male N=155	Female N=286
0-16	22%	13%
17-48	27	16
49-96	22	27
97-144	9	11
145-192	6	11
193-288	9	13
289-384	3	5
385-480	2	2
481-615	0	1
TOTAL	100%	99%
Mean days worked	84	120
Unknown (number)	(7)	(25)

TABLE 4.9

DAYS ACTUALLY WORKED IN FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Days actually worked	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
0-16	17%	28%	18%	27%
17-48	29	34	21	25
49-96	24	14	18	30
97-144	15	7	12	2
145-192	5	7	15	9
193-384	7	7	21	11
385-480	2	3	0	2
TOTAL	99%	100%	102%	99%
Mean days actually worked	83	70	107	75
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(5)	(1)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82
0-16	8%	17%	5%	17%
17-48	14	18	14	18
49-96	23	31	36	22
97-192	29	18	24	20
193-384	21	11	19	12
385-615	5	4	2	3
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%	101%
Mean days actually worked	146	105	119	113
Unknown (number)	(3)	(5)	(12)	(5)

Medical and Dental Service, First NYC Enrollment

Medical examinations were provided for many of the enrollees in the Prospective study, with this service most frequently being reported in sites with hospital User Agencies (see Table 4.10). In St. Louis, about 90 percent of the enrollees were provided medical examinations, in Durham, 60 percent, in Cincinnati, 25 percent, and in East St. Louis, almost none of the enrollees were reported to have received medical examinations. Compared to Durham male subjects, very significantly more Durham female subjects were provided medical examination; but in the other sites there were no significant differences between male and female subjects in this respect. Whether the enrollee received his examination as a part of NYC enrollment or in connection with his NYC work assignment apparently reflected the accessibility of User Agency services as much as health requirements in work assignments.

With the exception of St. Louis subjects, almost none of the enrollees in the Prospective study received dental examinations in their first NYC enrollments (see Table 4.11), and virtually none of the subjects received medical or dental treatment in the course of these enrollments (see Table 4.12). The number of "unknown's" was sometimes quite large in information concerning medical and dental examination and treatment; and it is possible that the counselors' failures to report should be considered as "none" rather than "unknown" to some extent. If so, the percentage of enrollees receiving examinations would be reduced, but the conclusions would remain the same: virtually no medical or dental treatment in any site; virtually no dental examinations except in St. Louis; and medical examinations provided as possible through the facilities of User Agency hospitals.

TABLE 4.10

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS
FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Location of Examination	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
No examination	82%	62%	97%	16%	66%
Examination					
Enrollment	8	21	0	41	16
Work Assignment	11	17	0	44	17
Other	0	0	3	0	1
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(13)	(20)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
No examination	74%	30%	96%	10%	47%
Examination					
Enrollment	9	41	0	60	31
Work Assignment	14	26	4	29	20
Other	3	3	0	1	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(2)	(5)	(10)	(20)

TABLE 4.11

DENTAL EXAMINATIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Location of Examination	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
No examination	100%	97%	100%	23%	82%
Examination:					
Enrollment	0	0	0	47	11
Work assignment	0	3	0	30	8
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%
Unknown	(3)	(0)	(4)	(15)	(22)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
No examination	98%	90%	100%	14%	73%
Examination:					
Enrollment	0	1	0	62	17
Work assignment	2	6	0	24	9
Other	0	3	0	0	1
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(2)	(6)	(11)	(23)

TABLE 4.12

MEDICAL AND/OR DENTAL TREATMENT PROVIDED, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Type of Treatment	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
No treatment	97%	97%	94%	97%	96%
Treatment:					
Medical	0	3	6	3	3
Medical and Dental	3	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(9)	(0)	(7)	(14)	(30)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
No treatment	95%	91%	100%	96%	95%
Treatment:					
Medical	3	6	0	3	3
Dental	0	1	0	0	0
Medical and Dental	2	1	0	1	1
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(4)	(9)	(10)	(28)

Some of the medical treatment (for example, in East St. Louis) occurred in connection with injuries suffered in work assignments; and very little treatment, obviously, could have been occasioned by the results of examinations. Although by no means all of the enrollees received medical or dental examinations, these results tended to bear out the initial impressions made by these enrollees--that is, predominantly of healthy appearance and with few physical impairments.

Number of Work Stations, First NYC Enrollment

Most subjects--71 percent of the male enrollees and 67 percent of the female enrollees--had a single work assignment in their earliest NYC enrollment (see Table 4.13). St. Louis subjects were significantly more apt than subjects in the other sites to have three, or more assignments, while subjects in Durham--compared to subjects in the other three sites--were very significantly more apt to have had a single assignment. In each of the sites, male subjects were as apt as female subjects to have had a single work assignment in their first NYC enrollment.

Number of Counselors, First NYC Enrollment

A little more than half of the subjects--56 percent of the male enrollees and 54 percent of the female enrollees--had a single NYC counselor in their first NYC enrollment (see Table 4.14). As with work stations, St. Louis subjects were significantly more apt than subjects in other sites to have had three, or more, counselors. In all sites, however, subjects tended to have more counselor than work assignment changes in the course of their first NYC enrollment--a tendency particularly marked in Durham.

TABLE 4.13

NUMBER OF WORK STATIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Number of Work Stations	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
One	76%	83%	70%	60%	71%
Two	24	13	22	13	18
Three-Eight	0	3	8	27	12
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%	100%	101%
Mean (number)	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.9	1.5
Unknown (number)	(4)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(6)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
One	71%	80%	64%	53%	67%
Two	18	20	36	24	23
Three-Eight	11	0	0	24	10
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	101%	100%
Mean (number)	1.4	1.2	1.4	2.0	1.5
Unknown (number)	(2)	(0)	(4)	(2)	(8)

TABLE 4.14

NUMBER OF ASSIGNED COUNSELORS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Number of Counselors	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
One	76%	47%	59%	42%	56%
Two	19	43	32	29	30
Three-nine	5	10	8	28	15
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	99%	101%
Mean (number)	1.3	1.7	1.5	2.2	1.7
Unknown (number)	(4)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(6)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
One	60%	62%	60%	39%	54%
Two	21	28	34	23	26
Three-nine	18	10	6	39	19
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	101%	99%
Mean (number)	1.6	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.8
Unknown (number)	(2)	(0)	(4)	(2)	(8)

Counselor change "went with" work station change in that--particularly in large work stations--NYC counselors were attached to a work station. The excess of counselor change over work station change reflected counselor turnover, to some extent, as well as some counselor re-assignment undertaken to achieve better adjustments between enrollees and NYC staff. The frequency of counselor change had one unfortunate side effect in that information forms (Counselor Reports and Termination Reports) were designed to be completed by the counselor who, it was anticipated, would have the widest knowledge of the enrollee. In point of fact, however, counselor change (for whatever reason) sometimes resulted in less extensive knowledge of the enrollee and, in some instances, missing information.

Remedial Education, First NYC Enrollment

Most subjects--81 percent of the male enrollees and 65 percent of the female enrollees--were not reported to have been assigned to remedial education locations in the course of their first NYC enrollments (see Table 4.15); and, in one site--East St. Louis--none of the subjects were reported to have been assigned to remedial education locations. Even though male subjects had greater educational deficiencies than did female subjects, they were very significantly less apt to have had such assignments. Remedical education was very significantly more apt to have been a part of the first NYC assignment in Durham where 40 percent of the male subjects (as compared with 12 percent in the three other sites) were assigned to remedial education. More female subjects in Durham, also, were assigned to remedial education. Among female subjects, remedial education was about as frequently reported in Durham and St. Louis; and, compared to the other two sites, very significantly more of the Durham and St. Louis female subjects were assigned to remedial education (48 percent as compared to 15 percent).

Reported hours of remedial education in the course of the first NYC assignment were very incomplete, with more than one hour being reported for only 18 male subjects and for only 67 female subjects. Subjects for whom hours of remedial education were reported, however, averaged substantial remedial education experience--133 hours among male subjects, and 142 hours among female subjects. For study subjects as a whole, however, study results indicated that NYC experience was associated with very little remedial education.

TABLE 4.15

NUMBER OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION LOCATIONS
FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Number of Locations	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
None	90%	60%	100%	72%	81%
One	5	40	0	28	17
Two-five	5	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(4)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
None	85%	49%	84%	54%	65%
One	15	51	16	45	34
Two-five	0	0	0	1	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown	(0)	(0)	(4)	(4)	(8)

Vocational Education, First NYC Enrollment

Vocational courses were reported for only one male and 23 female subjects. All of the vocational courses reported were for St. Louis subjects, except for six female subjects in Cincinnati and one in Durham. These fragmentary results suggest that skill training courses were very rarely part of NYC experience and, when such courses were incorporated into NYC experience, they were more apt to involve female subjects in larger city programs.

Counseling, First NYC Enrollment

Several kinds or sources of counseling were contemplated in the Termination Form--individual counseling, group counseling, Employment Service counseling, work station counseling, and NYC counseling. These breakdowns were occasioned by the recognition that counseling was a very important program component that was inherently difficult to bring into focus because of its close association with other program components. Reports of counseling in terms of kind, or source, and hours, however, tended to be incomplete.

Counseling from all sources averaged 22.4 hours for male subjects and 34.1 hours for female subjects in the first NYC enrollment (see Table 4.16). Since counseling could be expected to increase generally with length of time in the program, the larger average for female subjects did not necessarily mean that they were counseled at a higher rate. Roughly corrected for time in the NYC, average counseling hours per week suggested that male and female subjects were counseled to about the same extent in the several sites; but that counseling tended to be least extensive in Cincinnati and most extensive in Durham.

TABLE 4.16

AVERAGE COUNSELING HOURS AND AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Sex and Site	Mean Counseling Hours		Mean Weeks of NYC[a]		Average Counseling Hours Per Week[b]
Male Subjects	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	
Cincinnati	(37)	8.2	(41)	24.1	.3
Durham	(28)	36.2	(24)	12.4	2.9
East St. Louis	(26)	33.8	(33)	29.3	1.2
St. Louis	(35)	17.7	(44)	15.3	1.2
All Sites	(126)	22.4	(142)	20.6	1.1
Female Subjects					
Cincinnati	(66)	15.5	(66)	39.3	.4
Durham	(82)	48.3	(69)	20.1	2.4
East St. Louis	(37)	55.1	(41)	28.3	2.0
St. Louis	(61)	22.6	(78)	22.9	1.0
All Sites	(246)	34.1	(254)	27.3	1.3

[a] See Table 4.3. Mean weeks is mean days divided by 7.

[b] Mean Counseling hours divided by mean weeks.

Nine out of ten subjects for whom there was a report on Employment Service counseling hours were reported to have had no Employment Service counseling (see Table 4.17). Reporting was substantially complete in Cincinnati and Durham (95 percent of the subjects), and in these two sites, results definitely indicated that the Employment Service was virtually unused as a source of counseling. Reporting was far less complete in East St. Louis and St. Louis, but the results in these two sites suggested that the Employment Service provided some counseling in East St. Louis and almost none in St. Louis.

Considering the sum of average group counseling hours and average individual counseling hours as 100 percent, the emphasis on these two kinds of counseling varied considerably in the several sites (see Table 4.18). Cincinnati and Durham emphasized individual counseling, while East St. Louis and St. Louis emphasized group counseling. In these results, as in the counseling results previously discussed, there were no indications that different kinds or amounts of counseling tended to be provided for female subjects. Rather, such variations as were apparent, seemed to be associated with sites. Even in the site averaging most counseling time (Durham), however, counseling occupied little time compared to the major program component, work experience. It is to study results concerning work experience that we now turn.

TABLE 4.17

HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE COUNSELING, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Sex and Hours	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
None	92%	96%	69%	100%	90%
1-5	8	0	27	0	8
6-10	0	4	4	0	2
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown	(4)	(4)	(13)	(10)	(31)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
None	95%	94%	72%	98%	92%
1-5	3	4	19	2	5
6-20	2	2	8	0	3
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(1)	(18)	(26)	(44)

TABLE 4.18

GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects					
Group Counseling	14%	27%	59%	69%	50%
Individual Counseling	86	73	41	31	50
TOTAL[a]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Female Subjects					
Group Counseling	12%	30%	58%	77%	45%
Individual Counseling	88	70	42	23	55
TOTAL[a]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[a] Total is sum of average Group Counseling and average Individual Counseling hours reported for first NYC enrollment. Approximately two-thirds of all subjects reported.

NYC Assignment--Agency Worksites

The legislative authorization of the NYC directed local programs to develop NYC employment in State and local agencies and private non-profit organizations. The kinds of work-training available to NYC enrollees thus basically depended on the program's User Agencies--State or Federal installations such as veterans' hospitals or military bases; municipal departments and projects such as sanitation or welfare departments, hospitals or housing authorities; and organizations such as the Y's, NAACP, or the Urban League. As the programs stimulated by the Economic Opportunity Act developed, agencies or offices connected with the communities' anti-poverty efforts--neighborhood houses or offices and Community Action Programs--also became potential User Agencies. In general, most of the potential User Agencies could provide at least two kinds of work: maintenance and clerical. One of the major tasks of each local program, so far as User Agencies were concerned, was to develop User Agency potentials for more diversified employment experience. User Agencies in the several sites thus tended to vary between sites; and, within sites, to change in the course of time.

In the Experimental group as a whole (see Table 4.19), male subjects were most frequently first assigned to municipal work stations, while female subjects were most frequently first assigned to hospital or clinic work stations. In terms of User or Host Agencies female subjects had, perhaps, more diversified opportunities in that, if they didn't work in hospitals or clinics they had about equal chances to be assigned to five different types of agencies. If male subjects were not assigned to municipal agencies, however, they had about equal chances of being assigned to three different types of agencies.

TABLE 4.19

AGENCY WORKSITES, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Worksites	Male[a] N=155	Female[a] N=294
Hospitals, Clinics	23%	43%
Child care centers, Kindergartens, Schools	3	13
Military installations (NEC)[b]	24	14
Neighborhood Centers or Houses	5	11
Municipal (NEC)[c]	30	11
Other[d]	16	7
TOTAL	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(10)	(8)

---

[a] Co-op subjects without standard NYC experience excluded.

[b] Worksites other than hospital or child care in Air Force Base, Army Depot, Army Support Center, etc.

[c] Includes municiple offices of State or Federal organizations, except military.

[d] Includes YMCA's, YWCA's, Urban League, Cerebral Palsy Foundation, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, and similar local organizations.

The first NYC assignments of subjects in the several sites (see Table 4.20) indicated several interesting differences. Hospital worksites in St. Louis, for example, were as apt to be the first assignments of male as of female subjects; and in Durham, although female subjects were about twice as apt as male subjects to have first assignments in hospitals, hospital assignments were far more frequent than in either Cincinnati or East St. Louis. The importance of hospital assignments in Durham and St. Louis reflected not only local resources but program developments. A large Veterans' Administration hospital in Durham had recently become a User Agency at the time Prospective study subjects were enrolling, and many "new" workslots were available for them--42 of the 60 Durham hospital first assignments were in the VA hospital, while three other Durham hospitals provided the rest of these assignments. In St. Louis, on the other hand, seven hospitals including a VA hospital, were involved, with two--Homer Phillips and State--providing 39 of the 53 hospital first assignments. In the larger site, user arrangements with hospitals were more developed so that the new enrollees in the Prospective study represented a new cohort in agency workslots already partially filled with "old" enrollees. Hospital worksites could provide varied work experience with some potential for post-NYC employment, but they were not a program resource in East St. Louis primarily because hospital rates of pay were so low as to reduce attractiveness of hospital work-training and to inhibit the willingness of hospital administrators to add relatively highly-paid "trainees" to their staffs.

The addition of Scott Air Force Base to the User Agency list in East St. Louis occurred just prior to the beginning of the Prospective study, three-fourths of the first NYC assignments of study subjects in this site

TABLE 4.20

AGENCY WORKSITES, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Worksites[a]	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male subjects--Number[b]	41	30	39	45
Hospitals, Clinics	12%	29%	8%	43%
Child care centers, schools	5	7	0	0
Military installations (NEC)	0	0	67	28
Neighborhood Centers	15	0	0	3
Municipal (NEC)	44	32	22	20
Other	24	32	3	8
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	102%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(3)	(5)
Female subjects--Number[b]	72	85	55	82
Hospitals, Clinics	32%	63%	23%	46%
Child care centers, schools	25	19	8	0
Military installations (NEC)	0	0	54	18
Neighborhood Centers	28	0	0	15
Municipal (NEC)	4	11	12	16
Other	11	7	2	5
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(3)	(3)

---

[a] See notes, Table 4.19

[b] One male Cincinnati subject excluded--no standard NYC experience. Twenty female Cincinnati subjects excluded--no standard NYC experience.

were to SAFB. This agency provided 29 worksites in first assignments--worksites that could provide varied experience in the many kinds of work done on a large base--hospital, clinic, photo lab, procurement, property disposal, supply warehouse, roads and grounds, kitchen, laundry, etc. By re-activating little-used low grades of civilian job classifications, furthermore, the agency could provide some post-NYC employment opportunities. The Program's acquisition of SAFB as an agency was obviously of great importance to East St. Louis subjects who were thereby provided NYC work experience with, possibly, more vocational preparation potential than would otherwise have been the case.

The identity of agencies providing worksites for NYC enrollees might sometimes confer special qualities to work experience. NYC jobs in community action organizations, for example, might be quite different from NYC jobs in housing projects even though, in both instances, the actual work done might be the same (e.g., indoor maintenance or clerical). On the whole, however, the identity of agencies was primarily of interest as a descriptive variable related to sites rather than as an experience variable. As such, these results suggested that Cincinnati was, perhaps, richer than the other sites in the availability and variety of local community resources--an impression consistent with Cincinnati's size and social development. The identities of agencies in East St. Louis, on the other hand, suggested a site with few community resources (essentially, the city government), and correspondingly greater importance of the large Federal User Agency in this site.

First NYC Assignment--Kinds of Work

The work done by NYC enrollees had two general objectives: (1) to provide useful work-training for the enrollee; and (2) at the same time, to provide useful service to the User Agency. These two objectives did not always coincide, since the enrollees were often without vocational skills and hence could be most useful in work requiring little or no specific skills, but work of this nature obviously could add few if any specific skills that might improve the enrollee's post-NYC employment prospects. While each NYC job could provide valuable experience with respect to the acquisition of good work habits (getting to work on time, getting along with co-workers and with a boss, etc.), NYC job descriptions indicated that the vocational training potential of NYC jobs with respect to post-NYC employment was greater for female than for male subjects.

Two-fifths of the first NYC jobs of male subjects (see Table 4.21) were to Indoor or Outdoor Maintenance work-jobs that in the post-NYC world of work had few skill qualifications-and thus tended to be limited in work experience value to the acquisition of good work habits. About half of the first NYC jobs of male subjects connoted some specific skills or techniques--helpers or aides in skilled manual trades or crafts, technicians, clerical, food or health service. Some of these kinds of work--for example, food or health service--might not be in line with the occupational aspirations of male subjects; but they nevertheless might provide the subject with an opportunity to qualify for work above the unskilled level as well as give him an opportunity to explore occupations that might otherwise remain outside of his experience. The fairly traditional occupations for male workers

(Clerical, crafts, trades, or technicians) were represented by only 30 percent of the first NYC jobs of male subjects.

Two-fifths of the first NYC jobs of female subjects were in clerical work and thus might be the means of acquiring specific vocational skills of value in post-NYC employment as well as of acquiring good work habits. In addition, 30 percent of the first NYC jobs of female subjects were in kinds of work in which specific skills of value in conventional occupations in the world of work--food, health service, technicians or trades--might be acquired; and only 14 percent were in maintenance work where skill training might be minimal. Approximately the same proportion of female subjects had first jobs in education or child care (14 percent) or community work (2 percent)--jobs that often put the enrollee in association with professional workers and which provide new experiences and occupational goals to the enrollee.

Although work experience in maintenance jobs might, in particular instances, provide valuable work-training, NYC jobs of this kind generally connoted minimal opportunities to learn specific vocational skills that could be expected to enhance post-NYC employment. Among male subjects, first NYC jobs in maintenance work were more frequently reported in Cincinnati (see Table 4.22). Among male subjects, very significantly more first NYC jobs in maintenance were reported in Cincinnati (see Table 4.9) than in the other sites (66 percent as compared with 37 percent in the three other sites). In all sites, the proportion of female subjects with first NYC jobs in maintenance were very significantly lower.

TABLE 4.21

KINDS OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Kinds of Work	Male[a] N=155	Female[a] N=294
Office Clerical		
Secretarial, office aide, clerical trainee	5%	41%
Other Clerical		
Stock clerk, supply aide, warehouseman	6	0
Indoor Maintenance, Security		
Janitorial aide, porter, housekeeping aide, laundry aide, security guard, matron's aide	16	14
Outdoor Maintenance		
Groundskeeper, Conservation aide, landscape aide, water sewage aide, maintenance aide	27	0
Manual		
Helper to plumber, painter, sheet metal worker, heating and ventilating worker, mechanic, seamstress aide	12	2
Food		
Dietetic aide, kitchen aide, cook's aide	6	8
Health Service		
Hospital aide, nurse's aide, pharmacy aide	9	16
Community Worker		
Community aide, block worker, contact worker, client worker	2	2
Education or child care		
Education aide, teacher aide, child care, library aide, recreation aide	3	14
Other, Technicians and Miscellaneous		
Animal caretaker, photo lab helper, radio operator helper, laboratory aide	12	4
TOTAL	98%	101%
Unknown (number)	(11)	(11)

[a] Co-op subjects without standard NYC experience have been excluded.

TABLE 4.22

KINDS OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Kinds of Work[a]	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number[b]	41	30	39	45
Office clerical	2%	0%	3%	10%
Maintenance, Security	66	32	42	36
Health service	0	25	0	15
Other--Data, Things	22	39	53	36
Other--Persons	10	4	3	3
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(3)	(6)
Female Subjects--Number[b]	72	85	55	82
Office clerical	44%	19%	71%	41%
Maintenance, Security	8	17	12	13
Health Service	7	29	0	23
Other--Data, Things	19	14	2	17
Other--Persons	21	22	15	6
TOTAL	99%	101%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(3)	(4)

[a] Kinds of work based on categories in Table 4.21 as follows: Maintenance and Security includes Indoor and Outdoor Maintenance; Other--Data, Things includes Other Clerical, Manual, Food and Other; and Other--Persons includes Community worker, Education or Child Care.

[b] Co-op subjects without standard NYC experience have been excluded.

Specific vocational skills or techniques were connoted to some extent in work assignments involving standard or conventional occupations--clerical work and other work involving Data or Things. Among male subjects the highest proportion of such first NYC jobs was reported in East St. Louis (56 percent), while the lowest proportion occurred in Cincinnati. Among female subjects, the highest proportion of such first NYC jobs also occurred in East St. Louis (73 percent) with virtually all of these jobs being in clerical work, while the lowest proportion occurred in Durham. The difference between the lowest proportions (male subjects in Cincinnati, and female subjects in Durham) and the comparable proportions in the other sites combined were, statistically, very significant.

NYC jobs in Health Service and in other occupations involving persons (education, child care) to perhaps a large extent connoted "new" occupations for some of these untrained and ill-educated enrollees. To the extent that employment opportunities were developed in these fields, NYC experience in such service-to-persons work might represent enlarged occupational horizons for enrollees otherwise unfitted to perform any but unskilled work. Among male subjects, the hospital agencies in Durham and St. Louis were reflected in Health Service first assignments (25 percent and 15 percent respectively, as compared with none in Cincinnati and East St. Louis); and very few subjects in any site had assignments in service-to-persons work other than Health Service. Among female subjects in Durham and St. Louis, also, hospital agencies were reflected in very significantly more Health Service jobs in these sites, while very significantly fewer female subjects in St. Louis than in the other sites had other kinds of service-to-persons first jobs.

These results indicated that the vocational training potential of NYC work was higher for female subjects than for males in that their NYC assignments were more apt to provide opportunities to acquire occupational skills and techniques. Relatively more of the NYC jobs of female enrollees, furthermore, were in standard or conventional occupational fields--particularly in Cincinnati and East St. Louis. Finally, possibly "new" occupational ground was being opened in service-to-persons fields--Health Service jobs for both male and female enrollees, and other such jobs for female enrollees. The latter, by-products to some extent of expanding community services, were particularly apparent in Cincinnati and in Durham.

Number of Enrollees Assigned to Work Stations--First NYC Assignment

The work-training of enrollees assigned to stations providing experience for relatively few enrollees could be expected to differ from that of enrollees assigned to very large work stations. Relationships to supervisory personnel and to other workers, for example, would be simplified in one-enrollee station such as a welfare organization using a single clerical or maintenance aide; while, in a hospital station providing experience for many enrollees, these relationships might be more complex and entail different interpersonal skills.

Approximately half of the work stations in the earliest NYC assignments provided work experience for five, or fewer, NYC enrollees (see Table 4.23), and about one in ten stations provided experience for a single enrollee. On the other hand, 9 percent of the male subjects and 17 percent of the female subjects were assigned to large stations involving 26 or more enrollees. The information concerning the number of enrollees assigned to work stations was supplied by NYC counselors, but it is possible that in some instances the number of enrollees carried by the User Agency (for example, a hospital) was reported rather than the number of enrollees assigned to a station within the agency (for example, the hospital's X-ray unit).

TABLE 4.23

NUMBER OF ENROLLEES ASSIGNED TO WORK STATION,
FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Number	Male N=155	Female N=294
One	7%	10%
2-5	42	42
6-10	29	21
11-25	14	9
26-50	7	1
51 or more	2	16
TOTAL	101%	99%
Mean (number of enrollees)	9.1	18.5
Unknown (number)	(32)	(65)

A little more than one-fifth of the work stations of earliest assignment were not reported with respect to the number of enrollees assigned to them. Most of the missing information pertained to St. Louis (see Table 4.24), where nearly half of the work station information in this respect was missing. In the other sites, however, missing observations were far less extensive (11 percent). The excessive number of missing observations in St. Louis in this and other items of work assignments reports posed a reporting problem in that composite results tended to under-represent St. Louis, and the provision of composite results thus might be misleading. On the other hand, results were generally satisfactory in the other three sites and St. Louis results were sometimes more complete than in the present instance. It is hoped that the general practice of reporting site results as well as composite results will give the reader substantially accurate impressions.

Work stations in East St. Louis tended to involve fewer NYC enrollees than stations in Cincinnati and Durham (see Table 4.13). None of the East St. Louis stations had more than 10 enrollees, and 67 percent of the stations reported for male subjects and 75 percent of those reported for female subjects provided experience for from two through five enrollees. In contrast, 29 percent of the Cincinnati work stations and 42 percent of the Durham work stations were reported to involve more than 10 enrollees. Almost none of the Durham stations involved a single enrollee, so that almost all work experience in Durham provided work group experience--some in quite large groups. Almost all of the East St. Louis work stations for male subjects also involved work group experience, but 13 percent of the East St. Louis stations for female subjects involved a single enrollee-a single clerical, library or education aide in most instances. Single enrollee stations were somewhat more frequent in Cincinnati where 10 percent of the male subjects and 12 percent of subjects were first assigned to stations of this kind. On the whole, however, these data indicated that NYC work experience generally occurred in worksites involving more than one enrollee with enrollee work groups more frequently being larger (more than 10 enrollees) in Durham.

TABLE 4.24

NUMBER OF ENROLLEES ASSIGNED TO WORK STATION,
FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Number	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
One	10%	0%	3%	13%
2-5	38	33	67	26
6-10	30	22	30	35
11-25	13	41	0	4
26-50	10	4	0	13
51 or more	0	0	0	9
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Mean (number of enrollees)	8.9	10.0	4.6	15.2
Unknown (number)	(1)	(3)	(6)	(22)
Female Subjects--Number	72	85	55	82
One	12%	3%	13%	21%
2-5	42	27	75	32
6-10	16	30	13	21
11-25	9	14	0	10
26-50	20	1	0	3
51 or more	0	24	0	13
TOTAL	99%	99%	101%	100%
Mean (number of enrollees)	19.3	30.1	3.4	13.7
Unknown (number)	(3)	(11)	(7)	(44)

Abilities Required in First NYC Work Assignment

Work supervisors were asked to provide two ratings of work assignments: the levels of ability required by the assignment, and the levels of ability possessed by the enrollee. The latter ratings often were not supplied, possibly because they required more knowledge of the enrollee than the supervisor could be assumed to have. Two out of five of the first work assignments of male subjects and two out of three of those of female subjects, for example, required no tool skills (see Table 4.25) and the supervisors of these work assignments might not have had occasion to find out the enrollees' tool skills in the course of the assignment. In any case, supervisors' ratings of enrollee abilities were so often incomplete as to nullify their usefulness; and, consequently, enrollee abilities rating results have not been reported.

Approximately two-thirds of the first work assignments either required no tool skills or required abilities to use hand tools (see Table 4.25), and thus were fairly limited in their potential to provide manual skills. In Durham, significantly more of the male subjects (33 percent) than of the female subjects (12 percent) had first assignments that involved tool skills above the hand tool level (see Table 4.26), while in East St. Louis very significantly more of the female subjects than of the male subjects (46 percent, as compared with 16 percent) had first assignments of this tool skill level. The proportions of male and female subjects in Cincinnati with assignments involving tool skills above the hand tool level were more nearly equal, and exceeded the comparable proportions in Durham and East St. Louis. In the three most completely reported sites, then, first NYC assignments were quite different with respect to tool skills involved.

TABLE 4.25

TOOL SKILLS REQUIRED FOR FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Tool Skills	Male N=155	Female N=294
No tool skills required	44%	64%
1-Ability to use hand tools General cleaning tools, maintenance tools, mop, hammer, screwdriver, hand saw, grass sickle, shovel, wrench, tire tools, paint brush, ax	23	3
2-Ability to perform limited operations with machines Floor buffer, power saw, drill press, lawn mower, Vacuum cleaner, typewriter, 1050 IBM Datafax	19	22
3-Mastery of a specialized piece of equipment X-ray machine, Adding machine, short-wave radio, switchboard, photostat, microfilm, 650 copier	14	11
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(26)	(33)

TABLE 4.26

TOOL SKILLS REQUIRED FOR FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT
PROSPECTIVE STUDY SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Tool Skills[a]	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
No tool skills required	29%	56%	53%	44%
Ability to use hand tools	20	11	31	31
Ability to use machines or special equipment	52	33	16	24
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(20)
Female Subjects--Number	72	85	55	82
No tool skills required	32%	88%	54%	75%
Ability to use hand tools	6	0	0	5
Ability to use machines or special equipment	62	12	46	20
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(6)	(1)	(3)	(23)

[a] See Table 4.25 for examples of tool skills required.

Supervisors also rated work assignments in terms of responsibility levels, and levels of supervisory and interpersonal skill (see Table 4.27). First NYC work assignments varied most with respect to responsibility level: about two-thirds of the assignments of male subjects and about one-third of those of female subjects involved very limited responsibility (the following of explicit instructions only); intermediate levels of responsibility were reported for most of the rest of the jobs; and highest levels of responsibility were reported for a little more than one-twentieth of the jobs. In contrast, the proportions of jobs with minimal supervisory skill levels were 92 percent (male subjects) and 30 percent (female subjects).

As in several other instances involving information provided by work supervisors, skill levels in first NYC assignments were less completely reported (see Table 4.28) in St. Louis (72 percent) than in the other three sites (95 percent). In the three best-reported sites, the assignments of male subjects were very significantly more apt to be associated with minimal responsibility levels (following of simple, explicit instructions only) than were the assignments of female subjects. Compared to male subjects in Cincinnati and Durham, male subjects in East St. Louis were very significantly more apt to have first assignments involving minimal levels of responsibility.

TABLE 4.27

LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS REQUIRED FOR FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Levels	Male N=155	Female N=294
Responsibility Level		
1-Follow simple, explicit instructions	36%	19%
2-Follow two- or three-step explicit instructions	28	19
3-Follow general instructions, exercising common-sense judgment	24	41
4-Apply clear-cut policies to different situations	7	13
5-Apply general policies to wide varieties of situations	6	7
TOTAL	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(20)	(27)
Supervisory Skill Level		
1-No special supervisory skills needed	83%	60%
2-Give occasional instructions to other employees	9	20
3-Direct work of other employees for short periods of time	1	11
4-Ability to supervise a work group	7	9
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(21)	(33)
Interpersonal Skill Level		
1-Minimal. Works by himself	24%	14%
2-Work without serious conflict with others in work groups	66	66
3-Ability to smooth out difficulties among fellow-workers	6	12
4-A source of help and advice for fellow-workers	4	7
TOTAL	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(18)	(30)

TABLE 4.28

MINIMAL LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Minimal Skill Levels[a]	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
Responsibility	49%	52%	86%	68%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(14)
Supervision	82%	93%	97%	97%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(13)
Interpersonal	78%	92%	100%	92%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(4)	(4)	(20)
Female Subjects--Number	72	85	55	82
Responsibility	20%	38%	39%	62%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(21)
Supervision	71%	74%	91%	91%
Unknown (number)	(6)	(1)	(3)	(21)
Interpersonal	70%	83%	90%	82%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(22)

[a] Two lowest levels of skill as described in Table 4.27.

Supervisors also reported work assignments in terms of the reading, math, writing, and speech skills required (see Table 4.29). These skill reports were organized in terms of successively higher skill levels as, for example, reading skill levels ranged from "read signs" to "read a wide variety of written material."

The most varied skill levels were reported for reading; math and writing skills required were most frequently minimal (either none or the lowest skills level); and speech skills required were most frequently of the second level (communicate about work with co-workers). In each of these skill areas, the assignments of female subjects were significantly less apt than those of male subjects to be associated with minimal skill levels.

Although in each of the sites, the percentages of first assignments associated with minimal skill levels were larger for the assignments of male than of female subjects (see Table 4.30), the differences were sometimes too small to be statistically significant. There were, for instance, no significant differences between the first assignments of male and female Durham subjects with respect to minimal reading skills involved, while in St. Louis there were no significant differences between minimal skills levels of the assignments of male and female subjects except with respect to reading skill levels. On the other hand, compared to female subjects in the respective sites, male subjects in Cincinnati were very significantly more apt to have first assignments requiring minimal reading and writing skills; male subjects in Durham were significantly more apt to have first assignments requiring minimal reading, math, and writing skills.

TABLE 4.29

READING, MATH, WRITING, AND SPEECH SKILLS REQUIRED IN FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Skill Levels	Male N=155	Female N=294
Reading Skills Required for Job		
None	35%	12%
1-Read signs	16	6
2-Read single sentence instructions	25	23
3-Read instructions, one page or less	13	34
4-Read pamphlets, instruction manuals	7	10
5-Read wide variety of written material	4	15
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(21)	(33)
Math Skills Required for Job		
None	56%	38%
1-Counting	30	22
2-Make change	2	1
3-Perform addition and subtraction of whole numbers	8	29
4-Multiplication and division of whole numbers	2	7
5-Calculations involving fractions, decimals and percentages	2	3
TOTAL	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(22)	(34)
Writing Skills Required for Job		
None	68%	31%
1-Write short lists of objects	16	18
2-Prepare order forms	4	13
3-Write one or two sentence instructions	4	20
4-Write short reports of activities	4	10
5-Write short letters and reports using acceptable grammar	0	5
6-Correctly compose two and three-page letters and reports	2	3
TOTAL	98%	100%
Unknown (number)	(19)	(37)
Speech Skills Required for Job		
None	21%	10%
1-Transmit an instruction	9	6
2-Communicate about work with co-workers	56	46
3-Communicate in standard English to general public	11	33
4-Explain complex work operations to co-workers or to general public	4	5
TOTAL	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(19)	(27)

TABLE 4.30

MINIMAL SKILL LEVELS REQUIRED IN READING, MATH, WRITING AND SPEECH SKILLS FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT OF SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Skill	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
Minimal reading skill required	52%	19%	58%	70%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(13)
Minimal math skill required	80%	85%	97%	79%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(16)
Minimal writing skill required	78%	82%	92%	88%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(13)
Minimal speech skill required	24%	38%	14%	47%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(13)
Female Subjects--Number	72	85	55	82
Minimal reading skill required	18%	15%	6%	31%
Unknown (number)	(7)	(1)	(3)	(12)
Minimal math skill required	62%	54%	50%	78%
Unknown (number)	(8)	(1)	(3)	(22)
Minimal writing skill required	35%	58%	35%	66%
Unknown (number)	(8)	(1)	(3)	(25)
Minimal speech skill required	10%	15%	4%	34%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(21)

[a] Minimal skill level consist of "None" and "1" (lowest skill level), as more fully described in Table 4.29.

These results emphasized the predominantly (and perhaps necessarily) unskilled nature of NYC work assignments; and, as between male and female subjects, the higher skill levels of assignments for the latter.

Length of First NYC Assignment

First NYC assignments seldom lasted more than three months (see Table 4.31), and the assignments of male subjects were significantly shorter than those of female subjects. Eighty percent of male subjects had first assignments of less than three months and their average assignment was two months (67 days), while 60 percent of female subjects had first assignments of less than three months and their average assignment was about three months.

Shorter first assignments for male subjects characterized each of the sites (see Table 4.32); and, between sites, Cincinnati and Durham subjects had significantly longer first assignments than East St. Louis and St. Louis subjects. More of the subjects in East St. Louis and St. Louis, however, had multiple assignments in their first NYC enrollment (see Table 4.13), and the practice of re-assignment in these sites may have been a factor in shorter first assignments. Most subjects in East St. Louis and St. Louis, as well as in the other two sites, had a single assignment in their first enrollment and their total NYC experience was largely reflected in their first assignments.

TABLE 4.31

LENGTH OF EARLIEST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Length (Calendar Days)	Male N=155	Female N=294
0-30	43%	29%
31-90	39	35
91-180	12	21
181-270	3	7
271-360	0	4
361-900	4	3
TOTAL	101%	99%
Mean length (days)	67	95
Unknown (number)	(23)	(31)

TABLE 4.32

LENGTH OF EARLIEST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Length (calendar days)	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
0-30	32%	56%	44%	47%
31-90	39	24	44	43
91-180	20	12	8	7
181-360	2	4	3	3
361-900	6	4	0	0
TOTAL	99%	100%	99%	100%
Mean length (days)	103	66	46	46
Unknown (number)	(0)	(14)	(3)	(15)
Female Subjects--Number	72	85	55	82
0-30	15%	19%	27%	58%
31-90	30	44	45	23
91-180	32	17	25	11
181-360	16	16	2	8
361-900	7	4	0	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	100%
Mean length (days)	141	103	74	53
Unknown (number)	(1)	(8)	(4)	(18)

Supervisors' Ratings of Enrollees' Performance, First NYC Assignment

Supervisors were asked to rate enrollees' performance on a 5-point scale running from "Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising" (1) to "Outstanding" (5). On the average, the performance of female subjects in their first NYC assignment (see Table 4.33) was rated very significantly higher (3.4) than that of male subjects (3.1). In each of the sites (see Table 4.34) female subjects averaged higher overall performance ratings than did male subjects, although in no site was the difference large enough to be statistically significant.

Supervisors also rated a number of aspects of enrollees' work performance on 5-point scales defined by bi-polar adjectives; for example,(see Table 4.35) Punctuality was rated on a scale that ran from "Never on time" (1) to "Never late" (5). On each of these scales female subjects averaged higher ratings than male subjects, with the differences between averages being very significant in three scales: Dependability, Work Habits, and Quantity of Work. The highest averages achieved by female subjects (3.8) and by male subjects (3.7) were in Liked by Other Enrollees and in Attitude towards Authority; and among female subjects, in Appearance. The lowest averages (3.3 among female subjects and 3.1 among male subjects) were in Attendance and Initiative; and, among male subjects, in Dependability and Quantity of Work.

These results indicated that the strongest points in the performance of both male and female subjects were likableness and a cooperative attitude towards authority (that is, the supervisor). Their weakest points were in Attendance and Initiative; and, among male subjects, in Dependability and Quantity of Work. Although male subjects tended to be rated slightly lower than female subjects in every scale, their average performance was significantly inferior to that of female subjects in Dependability and Quantity of Work.

TABLE 4.33

SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Ratings	Male N=155	Female N=294
1-Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising	11%	7%
2-Unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement	15	14
3-About average	35	24
4-Average to good	29	41
5-Outstanding	10	15
TOTAL	100%	101%
Mean	3.1	3.4
Unknown (number)	(25)	(29)

TABLE 4.34

MEAN SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(41)	3.2	(70)	3.4
Durham	(27)	3.0	(82)	3.4
East St. Louis	(35)	3.1	(51)	3.6
St. Louis	(27)	3.2	(62)	3.3

TABLE 3.35

MEAN SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Aspects of Performance	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Punctuality 1-Never on time; 5-Never late	(132)	3.5	(267)	3.6
Attendance 1-Very unsatisfactory; 5-Perfect	(132)	3.1	(268)	3.3
Initiative 1-None; 5-Exceptional	(130)	3.1	(265)	3.3
Dependability 1-Needs constant supervision; 5-Highly reliable	(131)	3.1	(266)	3.5
Work Habits 1-Disorganized; 5-Efficient	(131)	3.2	(265)	3.5
Speed of Learning 1-Very slow; 5-Very quick	(129)	3.2	(261)	3.4
Quality of Work 1-Very inferior; 5-Outstanding	(130)	3.3	(267)	3.5
Quantity of Work 1-Very unsatisfactory; 5-Highly productive	(132)	3.1	(266)	3.4
Liked by Other Enrollees 1-Disliked; 5-Well-liked	(129)	3.7	(263)	3.8
Attitude Toward Authority 1-Hostile; 5-Cooperative	(131)	3.7	(263)	3.8
Appearance 1-Sloppy; 5-Neat	(126)	3.6	(267)	3.8
Interest in Fellow-Workers 1-Withdrawn; 5-Very interested	(130)	3.4	(265)	3.5

[a] Means based on 5-point scale defined, as indicated, by bi-polar adjectives.

Although many different work supervisors were involved in these ratings, it was of interest that the characteristics apparent in the composite results were also evident in each of the sites (see Table 4.36). In each of the sites, for example, the lowest averages for male subjects were lower than the lowest averages for female subjects, as were the highest averages except in St. Louis where the range for male subjects was 2.9 to 4.0 and that for female subjects was 3.1 to 3.8. Likableness and a cooperative attitude towards authority produced average ratings that were among the highest in each study sub-group, while aspects of actual work performance produced average ratings that were among the lowest in each study sub-group.

On the basis of overall performance ratings it could be concluded that about one-fourth of the study subjects left their first assignments before achieving satisfactory performance and that this work experience thus had been unproductive so far as work-training was concerned. The training potential of this first work experience, furthermore, was incompletely realized by the many enrollees who failed to achieve more than minimal ratings (1 or 2) in many aspects of work performance.

TABLE 4.36

MEAN SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF PERFORMANCE[a], FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Performance Aspect	Cin'ti		Durham		East St. Louis		St. Louis	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Male Subjects								
Punctuality	(41)	3.4	(27)	3.4	(35)	3.4	(29)	3.7
Attendance	(41)	3.2	(26)	3.2	(35)	3.3	(30)	2.9
Initiative	(41)	3.2	(27)	3.3	(35)	2.9	(27)	2.9
Dependability	(41)	3.2	(27)	3.2	(35)	3.0	(28)	2.9
Work Habits	(41)	3.2	(27)	3.3	(35)	3.1	(28)	3.0
Speed of Learning	(41)	3.2	(27)	3.2	(35)	3.3	(26)	3.0
Quality of Work	(41)	3.2	(27)	3.3	(35)	3.4	(27)	3.3
Quantity of Work	(41)	3.2	(27)	3.3	(35)	2.9	(29)	3.1
Liked by Other Enrollees	(41)	3.6	(27)	3.7	(35)	3.5	(26)	4.0
Attitude toward Authority	(41)	3.8	(27)	3.6	(35)	3.6	(28)	3.6
Appearance	(41)	3.7	(27)	3.5	(35)	3.3	(23)	3.7
Interest in Fellow-Workers	(41)	3.7	(27)	3.5	(35)	3.3	(23)	3.7
Female Subjects								
Punctuality	(70)	3.8	(84)	3.5	(51)	3.5	(62)	3.5
Attendance	(70)	3.5	(84)	3.4	(51)	3.4	(63)	3.1
Initiative	(70)	3.5	(83)	3.4	(51)	3.3	(61)	3.1
Dependability	(70)	3.6	(84)	3.4	(51)	3.7	(61)	3.3
Work Habits	(70)	3.6	(84)	3.4	(51)	3.5	(60)	3.4
Speed of Learning	(70)	3.4	(83)	3.5	(51)	3.4	(57)	3.2
Quality of Work	(70)	3.5	(84)	3.4	(51)	3.7	(62)	3.4
Quantity of Work	(70)	3.4	(84)	3.4	(51)	3.3	(61)	3.3
Liked by Other Enrollees	(70)	3.9	(84)	3.7	(51)	3.8	(58)	3.8
Attitude Towards Authority	(69)	4.0	(84)	3.8	(51)	3.6	(59)	3.8
Appearance	(70)	3.9	(84)	3.8	(51)	3.8	(62)	3.6
Interest in Fellow-Workers	(70)	3.5	(84)	3.5	(51)	3.4	(60)	3.5

[a] Means based on 5-point scales, defined by bi-polar adjectives, as indicated in Table 4.33.

Work Station Attitude Towards Enrollee

Counselors were asked to rate the attitude of other employees in the work station towards the enrollee (see Table 4.37). Ratings were provided for 85 percent of all the stations reported in the first NYC assignment, with the reporting percentage rising to 92 percent in the three better-reported sites (Cincinnati, Durham, and East St. Louis). On a 5-point scale running from "Hostile" (1) to "Helpful" (5), ratings averaged 3.7 for male subjects and 3.9 for female subjects. This slight difference in the ratings associated with male and female subjects was apparent in each of the sites, although in no instance was the difference large enough to be statistically significant. Between-site comparisons also indicated substantial similarity, although Cincinnati and Durham averaged higher in this respect than the other two sites. In general, these results indicated that regular employees in the work stations to which NYC enrollees were assigned were, on the whole, quite helpful towards the enrollee.

TABLE 4.37

MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS ENROLLEE IN WORK STATION,[a] FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(39)	3.7	(70)	4.0
Durham	(28)	4.0	(83)	4.1
East St. Louis	(31)	3.6	(49)	3.7
St. Louis	(32)	3.4	(54)	3.7
ALL SITES	(130)	3.7	(256)	3.9

[a] Mean of 5-point scale running from "Hostile" (1) to "Helpful" (5), for subjects reported (N).

Cooperation and Support of NYC Program by Work Station Manager

Counselors were asked to rate the cooperation and support of the NYC by the work station manager on a 5-point scale running from "None" (1) to "Complete" (5). Stations of first assignment for male subjects were rated 3.8 on the average, while those for female subjects were rated 4.0 on the average, (see Table 4.38). The slight differences apparent in the ratings of attitudes of employees were also apparent in ratings of cooperation and support: stations associated with female subjects tended to produce slightly higher average ratings, as did the stations in Cincinnati and Durham.

TABLE 4.38

MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF COOPERATION AND SUPPORT OF NYC PROGRAM BY WORK STATION MANAGER, #1 NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(39)	4.0	(70)	4.0
Durham	(28)	4.0	(83)	4.2
East St. Louis	(31)	3.6	(49)	3.8
St. Louis	(32)	3.6	(53)	3.9
ALL SITES	(130)	3.8	(255)	4.0

[a] Mean of 5-point scale running from "None" (1) to "Complete" (5), for subjects reported (N).

Attention Paid to Training by Work Supervisor

Counselors were asked to rate the attention paid to training by work supervisors on a 5-point scale running from "None" (1) to "Great" (5). Again the slight differences apparent in average ratings of employee friendliness and of work station cooperation were evident, (see Table 4.39). Ratings of attention paid to training, however, tended to be lower than the other two ratings, in that the ratings associated with male subjects averaged 3.4 while those associated with female subjects averaged 3.8.

TABLE 4.39

MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF ATTENTION WORK SUPERVISOR PAID TO TRAINING,[a] FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(39)	3.4	(70)	3.6
Durham	(28)	3.6	(83)	3.9
East St. Louis	(31)	3.3	(49)	3.8
St. Louis	(32)	3.2	(56)	3.8
ALL SITES	(130)	3.4	(258)	3.8

[a] Mean of 5-point scale running from "None" (1) to "Great" (5), for subjects reported (N).

Supervisory Behavior and Attitude

Counselors were also asked to rate work supervisors with respect to the character of their discipline, their relationship with enrollees, and their attitude toward enrollees. Average ratings in these aspects of supervisory behavior indicated (see Table 4.40) that discipline tended to be on the firm side, and that supervisory behavior was characteristically considerate and helpful. In the composite means there were no significant differences between the supervision associated with male and female subjects although the means associated with male subjects were, in each scale, a little lower than those associated with female subjects.

TABLE 4.40

MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF WORK SUPERVISOR,[a]
FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Rating Scales	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Discipline 1-Lax; 5-Firm	(129)	3.5	(256)	3.7
Relationship with Enrollee 1-Impersonal; 5-Considerate	(129)	3.6	(257)	3.7
Attitude 1-Hostile; 5-Helpful	(130)	3.7	(257)	3.9

[a] Means of 5-point scales defined by bi-polar adjectives, as indicated, and based on number reported (N).

Much the same situation obtained in site results (see Table 4.41) except that discipline associated with male subjects was significantly more lax in East St. Louis. The average rating of discipline in the work stations of first assignment for male subjects in East St. Louis was 3.2--significantly lower than the comparable average for male subjects in Durham, and very significantly lower than the comparable average for female subjects in East St. Louis.

TABLE 4.41

MEAN COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF WORK SUPERVISOR,[a]
FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Rating Scales[b]	Cin'ti		Durham		East St. Louis		St. Louis	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Male Subjects								
Discipline (firmness)	(39)	3.6	(28)	3.8	(31)	3.2	(31)	3.1
Relationship (consideration)	(39)	3.7	(28)	3.7	(31)	3.5	(31)	3.3
Attitude (helpfulness)	(39)	3.9	(28)	3.9	(31)	3.6	(32)	3.5
Female Subjects								
Discipline (firmness)	(70)	3.8	(83)	3.7	(49)	3.7	(54)	3.6
Relationship (consideration)	(70)	3.8	(83)	3.9	(49)	3.8	(55)	3.4
Attitude (helpfulness)	(70)	4.0	(83)	4.1	(49)	3.8	(55)	3.6

[a] Means of 5-point scales based on number reported (N).

[b] See Table 4.39 for fuller descriptions of scales.

Summary of Counselor's Ratings of Work Stations and Supervision

The counselors' ratings reported above obviously involved the counselors as well as the work stations in the several study sites. Between-site comparisons, therefore, should be viewed with caution. At the same time, it was of interest that counselors in Cincinnati and Durham tended to make more use of higher ratings--in five of the six scales reported, Cincinnati and Durham averages were higher than East St. Louis and St. Louis averages, and in the sixth (attention paid to training) Cincinnati and Durham averages were higher except for averages associated with female subjects in Cincinnati. The pattern of these results suggested possibly more counselor enthusiasm in Cincinnati and Durham, and possibly more critical counselor attitudes in East St. Louis and St. Louis that might or might not be reinforced by site circumstances with respect to work stations and work supervision.

The frequency with which counselors used minimal ratings (ratings of "1" or "2") indicated more site variation and, by implication, less generalized counselor contribution to the ratings (see Table 4.42). Regardless of possible site biases, counselors in the several sites obviously discriminated in terms of the scale and the subject; and, even in the "good" site of Durham male subjects, in the view of the counselor, had about a one in ten chance of being assigned to a station that paid little or no attention to training, and in which supervision tended to be impersonal and hostile. Percentages of minimal ratings, as well as average ratings, repeatedly indicated that female subjects were more apt than male subjects to be assigned to work stations that were more highly rated. Percentages of minimal ratings, however, indicated that some of the higher means associated with female subjects were the result of more stations with higher ratings rather than fewer stations with low ratings.

TABLE 4.42

MINIMAL RATINGS OF WORK STATIONS AND SUPERVISION, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT[a] SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Ratings	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects				
Other employees hostile	13%	4%	10%	6%
Little cooperation with NYC	11	4	11	3
Little attention paid to training	21	15	16	13
Lax discipline	3	8	19	26
Impersonal supervision	10	11	16	19
Hostile supervision	3	11	10	13
Female Subjects				
Other employees hostile	4%	2%	6%	6%
Little cooperation with NYC	11	1	6	6
Little attention paid to training	14	4	8	7
Lax discipline	9	9	4	6
Impersonal supervision	10	5	4	15
Hostile supervision	8	2	8	11

[a] Percent of subjects reported associated with ratings of "1" or "2" in respective scales. See Tables 4.38 through 4.41 for fuller descriptions of scales.

Several items in the Counselor Report sought to establish the foundation for counselor ratings in terms of the counselor's direct experience with the work station and supervisor involved (Section III of SRG/NYC 03). The rate of response to these items (less than half of first NYC assignments were reported in this connection) nullified this effort. It is possible that these disappointing results were due, in part, to personnel changes, and, if so, counselor ratings probably reflected general NYC impressions to some extent rather than the counselors' specific experiences with the work station and its supervisor.

Enrollee Gains in Preparations for the World of Work

Counselors were asked to describe what gains had been made by the enrollee in the course of his NYC assignment with respect to preparations for the world of work. Counselors' reports of such gains were available for the first NYC assignments of 72 percent of the subjects, and were categorized into three broad kinds of gains (see Table 4.43). The largest category (44 percent of the male subjects, and 45 percent of the female subjects) contained reports that specifically mentioned the acquisition of job skills or job sequels to NYC experience. The second largest category (21 percent of the male subjects, and 29 percent of the female subjects) contained reports describing gains in work habits or attitudes and behaviors important to work performance, and the third category contained reports of personal development or improvement other than those in the areas of job skills or work habits. When several kinds of improvement were reported, the response was counted in the first category if job skills or employment were specified, and in the second category if work habits (but not job skills) were reported.

TABLE 4.43

ENROLLEE GAINS IN PREPARATION FOR THE WORLD OF WORK FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Gains	Male N=155	Female N=298
No gains in preparations for the world of work	28%	14%
Acquired job skills, job skills and good work habits and/or attitudes Learned to use cleaning equipment; Increased typing speed; Learned to use machine and mount pictures; Progressed and developed own permanent job; Qualified for permanent employment.	44	45
Acquired good work habits and/or attitudes Learned necessity of showing interest in work, of getting to work on time, working every day; Learned to work without constant supervision; Became more ambitious; Improved in work performance; Learned to work with others.	21	29
Personal development and improvement, education Improved appearance, self-concept, motivation; Acquired educational credentials; Completed High School, applied for college and was accepted; Learned importance of education	7	13
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(43)	(84)

Although reporting was quite incomplete in St. Louis and for female subjects in Durham (see Table 4.44) reports for the other study subgroups were quite complete and indicated that the first assignments, in the observation of the counselors, had been differential in their effects. In Cincinnati, significantly more female subjects than male subjects were considered to have made gains in their earliest NYC assignment. Compared to female subjects in Durham, however, male subjects were very significantly more apt to have made gains, while male subjects in East St. Louis were significantly more apt than male subjects in either Cincinnati or Durham to have made gains. The first NYC assignments of East St. Louis subjects--both male and female--were characterized by gains in job skills, while gains in work habits were about as frequently reported as gains in job skills in Cincinnati, and gains in job skills were rarely reported for male subjects in Durham.

TABLE 4.44

ENROLLEE GAINS IN PREPARATION FOR THE WORLD OF WORK, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Gains[a]	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
No gains	24%	53%	9%	40%
Job skills, jobs skills and other	29	5	82	40
Work habits and/or attitudes	35	37	6	12
Personal Development, general	12	5	3	8
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(7)	(11)	(5)	(20)
Female Subjects--Number	72	85	54	82
No gains	9%	26%	2%	18%
Job skills, job skills and other	30	24	98	35
Work habits and/or attitudes	45	30	0	35
Personal development, general	16	14	0	12
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(9)	(35)	(7)	(33)

[a] See Table 4.43 for fuller descriptions of gain categories.

Detrimental Aspects of First NYC Assignment

In their reports of work assignments, counselors were asked to indicate whether there had been any detrimental aspects in the experience and, if so, to describe such aspects. Most of the first NYC assignments were reported not to have had any detrimental aspects (see Table 4.45). About one-fourth of the assignments associated with male subjects and about one-tenth of those associated with female subjects, however, were considered by the counselors to have had detrimental aspects. Among male subjects, detrimental aspects pertaining to the kind of work involved in the assignment were most frequently reported with half of all the detrimental aspects falling in this category. Among female subjects the most frequently reported detrimental aspects involved bad work habits or poor social attitudes that were either uncorrected or fostered by the work experience.

About 80 percent of all the first NYC assignments were reported in this connection, (see Table 4.46) with the reporting proportion being higher in Cincinnati, Durham, and East St. Louis (90 percent) than in St. Louis (59 percent). In the three most fully reported sites, detrimental aspects were very significantly more frequently reported for male subjects than for female subjects (26 percent, as compared with 9 percent), and about half of the detrimental aspects of the assignments of male subjects related to poor work experience (inappropriate or ineffective work-training). Detrimental aspects of the experience of male subjects were most apparent in East St. Louis where counselors reported that 27 percent of the male subjects, but none of the female subjects, had had poor work experience. These results seemed to echo the counselors' low average discipline ratings for the supervisors of these subjects (see Table 4.41).

TABLE 4.45

DETRIMENTAL ASPECTS OF FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Detrimental Aspects	Male N=155	Female N=298
None	73%	88%
Bad work habits or poor social attitudes uncorrected or fostered Supervisor set a bad example, Supervision too permissive, Discipline too lax; Didn't adjust to co-workers or supervisor; Critical rather than co-operative.	4%	8%
Inappropriate or ineffective work experience Work did not improve job skills, work not demanding enough, underemployed, did not learn specific skills, Work too difficult, dangerous, or unpleasant.	13%	2%
Other Poor job situation contributed to enrollee's anxiety	5%	3%
Not specified	5%	0%
TOTAL	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(32)	(51)

TABLE 4.46

DETRIMENTAL ASPECTS OF FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Aspect[a]	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
No detrimental aspects	74%	85%	67%	69%
Bad work habits, poor attitudes	13	0	0	0
Poor work experience	8	4	24	15
Other and unspecified	5	12	9	15
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(4)	(6)	(19)
Female Subjects--Number	76	85	55	82
No detrimental aspects	82%	94%	100%	73%
Bad work habits, poor attitudes	13	4	0	4
Poor work experience	1	2	0	12
Other and unspecified	3	0	0	10
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(8)	(4)	(6)	(33)

[a] See Table 4.45 for fuller descriptions of detrimental aspects.

Overall Improvement, First NYC Enrollment

Counselors rated the overall improvement of enrollees in their first NYC enrollment on a 5-point scale running from "None" (1) to "Great" (5). Except in St. Louis where male and female subjects averaged the same (3.6), male subjects averaged lower in overall improvement than did female subjects. In Cincinnati and East St. Louis (see Table 4.47), significantly more male subjects were considered to have made "none" or very little overall improvement (rated 1 or 2)--32 percent and 29 percent respectively--than were female subjects (12 percent and 16 percent, respectively).

Counselors were also asked to indicate the extent of improvement, if any, in a number of employability areas (see Table 4.48). Among both male and female subjects the areas of strongest program effect were Responsibility and Approach: more than half of the subjects had made "some" or "great" improvement in these areas. "Some" or "great" improvements were also reported fairly frequently (from 32 percent to 42 percent, among male subjects, and from 39 percent to 71 percent among female subjects) in the areas of Appearance, Speech, and Interpersonal Skills. One-fifth, or fewer, subjects were reported to have made any improvement in Tool Skills, Supervisory Skills, or the Reading, Arithmetic, Writing Skills, or Speech Skills. Compared to male subjects, female subjects were significantly more often reported to have made some improvements in Appearance, Supervisory Skills, and Reading, Arithmetic, Speech and Writing Skills. These results indicated that, in the observation of the counselors, the NYC programs were most often effective in general areas of character, attitude, and behavior and least often--in fact, rarely--effective in improving specific job or "school" skills.

TABLE 4.47

COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF OVERALL IMPROVEMENT, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Overall Improvement	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45	155
1-None	16%	21%	3%	6%	11%
2	16	7	26	19	17
3	32	14	29	13	23
4	18	39	31	13	25
5-Great	11	4	0	39	13
Unable to rate	8	14	11	10	11
TOTAL	101%	99%	100%	100%	100%
Mean overall improvement	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.1
Unknown (number)	(3)	(2)	(4)	(14)	(23)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82	286
1-None	3%	9%	6%	6%	6%
2	9	13	10	15	12
3	21	31	24	24	26
4	39	35	39	19	33
5-Great	17	10	14	31	18
Unable to rate	11	3	6	3	6
TOTAL	100%	101%	99%	100%	101%
Mean overall improvement	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.5
Unknown (number)	(2)	(2)	(5)	(20)	(29)

TABLE 4.48

COUNSELORS' RATINGS OF IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY AREAS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Employability Area and Improvement	Male N=155	Female N=286	CL[a]
	Percent[b]		
Appearance: None	58%	29%	**
Some	37	55	
Great	5	16	
Speech: None	68%	61%	ns
Some	30	34	
Great	2	5	
Approach: None	49%	45%	ns
Some	44	41	
Great	7	14	
Reading Skills: None	90%	78%	**
Some	8	19	
Great	2	3	
Arithmetic Skills: None	94%	86%	*
Some	6	13	
Great	0	1	
Writing Skills: None	93%	82%	**
Some	6	16	
Great	1	2	
Speech Skills: None	90%	78%	**
Some	10	20	
Great	0	3	
Responsibility: None	41%	35%	ns
Some	42	41	
Great	18	24	
Tool Skills: None	81%	84%	ns
Some	12	10	
Great	6	6	
Interpersonal Skills: None	62%	53%	ns
Some	33	35	
Great	5	12	
Supervisory Skills: None	99%	92%	**
Some	1	6	
Great	0	2	
Unknown (number)	(42)	(35)	

[a] CL=Confidence Level; * is "significant" (.05); ** is "very significant" (.01) and "ns" is "not significant" (> .05).

[b] Percents based on number reporting. Percent totals not included to save space.

Site results in the employability areas most frequently associated with improvement, as well as in Tool Skills (see Table 4.49) indicated that the more frequently reported improvements among female subjects were most apparent in Cincinnati and Durham. Compared to male subjects, in Cincinnati, very significantly more of the female subjects were reported to have improved in appearance (72 percent as compared with 27 percent) and very significantly more were reported to have improved in speech (44 percent as compared to 13 percent). In Durham, female subjects were also very significantly more apt than male subjects to have improved in appearance (70 percent as compared with 37 percent); and they were significantly more apt to have improved in Interpersonal Skills (51 percent as compared with 26 percent). In East St. Louis and St. Louis, on the other hand, none of the differences between the proportions of improvement reported for male and female subjects was large enough to be statistically significant.

Comparisons of reported improvements between male and female subjects within sites indicated that male subjects in Durham were significantly more apt to have improved in Tool Skills (22 percent as compared with 6 percent). This result--the only instance of significantly more improvement among male subjects--reflected the very slight improvement of female subjects in this area as much as greater improvement among male subjects.

TABLE 4.49

IMPROVEMENT, SELECTED EMPLOYABILITY AREAS,[a] FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Employability Area	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	30	27	32	24
Appearance	27%	37%	56%	50%
Speech	13	19	63	29
Approach	44	41	53	59
Responsibility	54	56	53	79
Tool Skills	27	22	13	12
Interpersonal Skills	40	26	28	63
Female Subjects--Number	64	78	47	62
Appearance	72%	70%	67%	66%
Speech	44	36	60	23
Approach	51	44	49	58
Responsibility	74	60	70	57
Tool Skills	20	6	28	12
Interpersonal Skills	52	51	23	55

[a] Some or great improvement reported.

Termination Conditions, First NYC Enrollment

Counselors were asked to check all of a number of listed termination conditions that might have been factors in enrollees' terminations from the NYC, and to describe any unlisted circumstance that might have been a factor in the termination. Only five percent of the terminations reported for first NYC enrollments involved conditions additional to those provided on the termination form (see Appendix D), and 1.4 termination conditions, on the average, were reported for study subjects (see Table 4.50). In the composite study group, the termination conditions of male subjects differed very significantly from those of female subjects in two respects: post-NYC employment was much more frequently reported for male subjects (32 percent, as compared to 14 percent); and conditions independent of the world of work or the NYC (care for family, pregnancy, or marriage) were frequently reported for female subjects (21 percent) but not for male subjects.

Conditions compatible with the employment objectives of the NYC (employment, service in the Armed Forces, school, or work training-programs) were reported for very significantly more of the male than of the female subjects (50 percent as compared with 32 percent).

Post-NYC employment was reported as a termination condition for more male than female subjects in each of the sites (see Table 4.51)--very significantly more frequently in Durham and East St. Louis. When post-NYC school or training termination conditions were added to employment, termination conditions compatible with employment objectives were still more frequently reported for male subjects in each site; but the difference between male and female subjects in this respect was large enough to be statistically significant only in East St. Louis. Conditions reflecting maladjustment to the NYC from the program's point of view (poor attendance, misconduct, failure to adjust) were more frequently reported for male subjects in each of the sites except East St. Louis. Differences between male and female subjects within sites in this respect were not large enough to be statistically significant.

Compared to the termination conditions of male subjects in the other sites, significantly more of the termination conditions of male subjects in East St. Louis involved post-NYC employment, and significantly fewer conditions involved maladjustment to the NYC from the program's point of view.

TABLE 4.50

TERMINATION CONDITIONS,
FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Termination Conditions	Male N=155	Female N=286
Employment	32%	14%
Armed Forces	6	0
School	5	6
MDTA, Job Corps, OJT, other training	7	12
Administrative restraints--expiration of contract, age or income ineligibility	5	5
Program decision--poor attendance, misconduct, failure to adjust	35	34
Enrollee dissatisfaction--earnings, hours, dislike job or staff	12	10
Moved from area	11	12
Care for family	0	14
Marriage or pregnancy	0	15
Illness of enrollee	5	7
Institutionalized	1	1
Other	19	8
TOTAL[a]	138%	138%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(12)

[a] More than one condition could be reported.

TABLE 4.51

TERMINATION CONDITIONS, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sex and Termination Conditions	Cin'ti	Durham	East St. Louis	St. Louis
Male Subjects--Number	41	30	39	45
Employment, Armed Forces	39%	35%	52%	29%
School or training program	10	6	14	15
Program decision--				
Administrative	0	0	6	11
Discretionary	41	55	14	38
Enrollee initiative:				
Dissatisfaction with NYC	10	21	14	7
Illness	0	10	3	7
Moved from area	12	14	8	9
Other	20	10	14	31
TOTAL[a]	132%	151%	125%	147%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(3)	(0)
Female Subjects--Number	68	82	54	82
Employment	28%	9%	10%	11%
School or training program	18	14	20	20
Program decision--				
Administrative	1	5	4	9
Discretionary	26	44	31	31
Enrollee initiative:				
Dissatisfaction with NYC	9	9	18	8
Family, pregnancy, marriage	28	27	36	29
Illness	4	7	4	9
Moved from area	10	17	8	9
Other	9	9	10	11
TOTAL[a]	133%	141%	141%	137%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(5)	(7)

[a] More than one condition could be reported

Post-NYC Plans, First NYC Enrollment

Counselors were asked to indicate on the Termination Form whether the subjects planned to get a job, enroll in further vocational training or return to school and, if so, to give the name and address of the employer, school, or training program. This information overlapped the termination information just reported, and it was of interest that, in this part of the Termination Form, more subjects were reported to have plans for employment, school, or further training than were so reported in termination conditions. Names and/or addresses of employers, schools or training programs were supplied, however, for only 34 percent of the male subjects and for 32 percent of the female subjects. These results suggested that counselors often had little specific knowledge of the plans of prematurely separated enrollees.

Single and Multiple NYC Assignment Experience

In the course of the Prospective study, it was tentatively concluded that re-assignment and re-enrollment sometimes might be essential to the achievement of program objectives. Satisfactory adjustments to the NYC, for example, might require re-assignment from some work stations of first assignment; and, continued progress in the acquisition of work habits and skills might depend on transfers to work stations providing more advanced work experience. In much the same way, the achievement of program objectives in the many cases involving premature separations from the NYC seemed to indicate the necessity of re-enrollment.

Program reports of NYC experience in the Prospective study indicated that re-assignment and re-enrollment characterized the experience of few enrollees: only 14 percent of the subjects were reported to have had more than one NYC enrollment, and only 29 percent of all enrollments involved more than one NYC assignment. The small number of enrollees involved in multiple assignments and/or enrollments limited the usefulness of study results with respect to establishing the characteristics of NYC experience of this kind. At the same time, results for the study group as a whole permitted some conclusions in this area of the data.

Work Performance and Assignment Experience, First Enrollment

Compared to subjects with a single work assignment in their first NYC enrollment, very significantly more subjects--both male and female--with multiple work assignments received low ratings from their work supervisors in their first assignments (see Table 4.52). These results indicated that re-assignment was more apt to be associated with poor performance in the initial assignment and was a mechanism for improving adjustment to NYC work experience rather than a means of enriching or broadening initially satisfactory work experience.

Work performance ratings in the first assignments of male subjects with multiple assignments in their first NYC enrollment and work performance ratings in the last assignments of these subjects were substantially the same (see Table 4.53). A similar comparison of the ratings of female subjects, however, showed significantly fewer low ratings (ratings of "1" and "2") in the last assignments (38 percent as compared with 18 percent). These results indicated that re-assignment may have been a factor in improved performance among female subjects.

TABLE 4.52

SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ENROLLEE WORK PERFORMANCE, FIRST NYC ASSIGNMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENT IN FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT,[a] BY SEX

Ratings of Enrollee Work Performance	Sex and Assignment Experience			
	Male		Female	
	Single N=119	Multiple N=36	Single N=229	Multiple N=57
1-Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising	8%	20%	6%	13%
2-Unsatisfactory, but showed some improvement	12	27	11	25
3-About average	36	30	25	21
4-Above average	32	20	43	31
5-Outstanding	12	3	16	10
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%
Mean Work Performance Rating	3.3	2.6	3.5	3.0
Unknown (number)	(19)	(6)	(11)	(9)

[a] Single assignment experience consisted of one reported assignment and multiple assignment experience consisted of two or more reported assignments. Approximately 15 percent of the first assignments reported were described as "second" work stations on Terminations Forms.

TABLE 4.53

SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ENROLLEE WORK PERFORMANCE, FIRST AND LAST NYC ASSIGNMENTS IN FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS, BY SEX

Ratings of Enrollee Work Performance	Sex and Assignment			
	Male		Female	
	First	Last	First	Last
	N=36		N=57	
1-Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising	20%	19%	13%	8%
2-Unsatisfactory, but showed some improvement	27	23	25	10
3-About average	30	29	21	33
4-Above average	20	19	31	35
5-Outstanding	3	10	10	14
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean Work Performance Rating	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.4
Unknown (number)	(6)	(5)	(9)	(8)

Performance ratings of male subjects in their final first enrollment assignments (see Table 4.54) showed that significantly more of the multiple-assignment than of the single-assignment enrollees had low ratings (42 percent as compared with 20 percent). Among female subjects, however, the performance ratings of subjects with multiple assignments were about the same as those with a single assignment. These results provided additional support for the conclusion above that re-assignment was associated with improved performance among female subjects.

TABLE 4.54

SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF ENROLLEE WORK PERFORMANCE, FINAL NYC ASSIGNMENT, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS, BY SEX

Ratings of Enrollee Work Performance	Sex and Assignment Experience			
	Male		Female	
	Single N=119	Multiple N=36	Single N=229	Multiple N=57
1-Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising	8%	19%	6%	8%
2-Unsatisfactory, but showed some improvement	12	23	11	10
3-About average	36	29	25	33
4-Above average	32	19	43	35
5-Outstanding	12	10	16	14
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%
Mean Work Performance Rating	3.3	2.8	3.5	3.4

Overall Improvement in Employability and Assignment Experience

Counselors' average ratings of overall improvement in employability at the end of the first NYC enrollment (see Table 4.55) were about the same for subjects with a [illegible] assignment as for subjects with more than one assignment. Since enrollees with single assignments were given a significantly higher rating by work supervisors (see Table 4.52), it seems reasonable to conclude that multiple assignments improved the employability of the enrollees.

TABLE 4.55

OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ASSIGNMENTS, BY SEX

	Male		Female	
Overall Improvement	Single N=119	Multiple N=36	Single N=229	Multiple N=57
1-No improvement	15%	6%	7%	6%
2-	20	19	11	16
3-	17	47	28	24
4-	33	13	36	32
5-Great improvement	15	13	18	22
TOTAL	100%	98%	100%	100%
Mean Improvement	3.2	3.0	3.5	3.5
Unknown (number)	(33)	(4)	(37)	(7)

Overall Improvement in Employability and Enrollment Experience

Counselors' ratings of overall improvement in employability at the end of the first NYC enrollment tended to be lower for subjects who re-enrolled than for subjects whose NYC experience consisted of a single enrollment (see Table 4.56). Among female subjects, very significantly fewer of the subjects with multiple enrollments were rated above average ("4" and "5") than were comparable subjects with a single NYC enrollment reported in the Prospective study (31 percent as compared with 57 percent). The number of male subjects with multiple NYC enrollments was too small to warrant the evaluation of differences in this respect. Fewer male subjects with multiple enrollment experience than comparable single-enrollment subjects, however, were rated above average (23 percent as compared with 45 percent); and, in the Experimental group as a whole the difference in this respect was significant at the .01

Confidence Level. These results indicated that the first enrollments of subjects with more than one NYC enrollment were less often considered to have produced above-average improvement than were the enrollments of subjects whose NYC experience consisted of a single enrollment.

TABLE 4.56

OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, FIRST NYC ENROLLMENT, SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ENROLLMENTS, BY SEX

Overall Improvement in Employability	Male		Female	
	Single N=137	Multiple N=18	Single N=241	Multiple N=45
1-No improvement	12%	15%	7%	6%
2-	20	15	12	14
3-	23	46	23	50
4-	30	15	36	28
5-Great improvement	15	8	21	3
TOTAL	100%	99%	99%	101%
Mean Improvement	3.2	2.9	3.5	3.2
Unknown (number)	(32)	(5)	(35)	(9)

Compared to overall improvement reported at the end of their first enrollments, the overall improvement reported at the end of the last enrollments of multiple-enrollment subjects (see Table 4.57) indicated no significant improvement changes in that mean ratings were about the same in the two enrollments and percentage changes in rating categories were not large enough to be statistically significant. At the time of their final exit from the NYC, the overall improvement ratings of multiple-enrollment subjects were lower, on the average, than the ratings of subjects who had had a single enrollment (see Table 4.58). Among female subjects, the proportion of multiple-enrollment subjects rated "4" and "5" increased in the last enrollment to the extent that the difference between female multiple- and single-enrollment subjects in this respect was not statistically significant; and the proportion of subjects rated average or above ("3", "4", and "5") was substantially the same in both types of enrollment experience (74 percent and 80 percent, respectively). These results suggested that re-enrollment, like re-assignment, tended to improve the effectiveness of NYC experience.

TABLE 4.57

OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, FIRST AND LAST NYC ENROLLMENTS, SUBJECTS WITH MULTIPLE ENROLLMENTS, BY SEX

Overall Improvement	Male First	Male Last	Female First	Female Last
	N=18		N=45	
1-None	15%	11%	6%	13%
2-	15	11	14	13
3-	46	66	50	33
4-	15	11	28	28
5-Great	8	0	3	13
TOTAL	99%	99%	101%	100%
Mean Improvement	2.9	2.7	3.2	3.2
Unknown (number)	(5)	(9)	(9)	(6)

TABLE 4.58

OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY, LAST NYC ENROLLMENT,[a] SUBJECTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTIPLE ENROLLMENTS, BY SEX

	Male		Female	
Overall Improvement	Single N=137	Multiple N=18	Single N=241	Multiple N=45
1-None	12%	11%	7%	13%
2-	20	11	12	13
3-	23	66	23	33
4-	301	11	36	28
5-Great	15	0	21	13
TOTAL	100%	99%	99%	100%
Mean Improvement	3.2	2.7	3.5	3.2
Unknown (number)	(32)	(9)	(35)	(6)

[a] Last enrollment of multiple-enrollment subjects compared to only enrollment of single-enrollment subjects.

Summary

Program-sourced information indicated that the NYC experience of subjects in the Prospective study characteristically consisted of one enrollment and one work assignment in that enrollment. The total length of NYC experience reported by program officials tended to be shorter than the length of NYC experience reported by enrollees. Bases for reconciling discrepant reports of length of NYC experience were lacking since there were indications that program information was sometimes incomplete particularly with respect to multiple enrollments, and that enrollee information was sometimes erratic. Program information, however, appeared to be reasonably accurate with respect to days in the first enrollment and days in the work assignments of the first enrollment.

The first enrollment of most study subjects--73 percent of the male subjects and 63 percent of the female subjects--lasted 180 calendar days or less. Program inputs aimed at enhancing the employability of study subjects thus were generally limited in time to less than six months.

The major component of NYC experience--work training--characteristically involved few specific occupational skills. Two-thirds of the first work assignments, for example, either required no tool skills or required only the ability to use hand tools (rakes, mops, shovels, etc.). The levels of responsibility and interpersonal skills required in first NYC assignments also tended to be low, and few of the first NYC assignments required more than minimal reading, math, writing or speech skills. Successful performance in these generally undemanding work situations thus would tend to involve work habits and social skills. Work supervisors rated the performance of most study subjects (74 percent of the male subjects, and 80 percent of the female subjects) at least average; and perceived the strongest points of enrollee performance to be good appearance, likeability, and a cooperative attitude towards authority.

Most subjects--81 percent of the male subjects and 65 percent of the female subjects--were not assigned to remedial education in their first NYC enrollment, and information describing the extent of remedial education for subjects involved in this program component was incomplete. For the relatively few subjects reported to have spent time in remedial education, average time in remedial education implied above-average time in the NYC: assuming four hours per week and four weeks per month, the 133-hour average of male subjects implied about eight months in the NYC and the 143-hour average of female subjects implied about nine months in the NYC. For most enrollees, however, program reports indicated that NYC experience included little or no remedial education.

Counseling was a uniform component of the programs studied in that all enrollees had counselors. Program-sourced information indicated that subjects averaged a little more than one hour of counseling per week, that most of the counseling was provided by the NYC, and that about half of the counseling was individual and the other half, group. Information concerning counseling tended to be incomplete so far as hours, source and kinds were concerned; and, it should be borne in mind, these aspects of counseling did not necessarily reflect the effective operation of the counseling component. At the same time, these results supported the impression that counseling, like remedial education, was a minor component compared to work experience.

At the end of the first reported NYC enrollment--the only enrollment reported for 86 percent of the subjects in the Prospective study--counselors reported that most subjects (61 percent of the male subjects, and 77 percent of the female subjects) had made "average" or better gains in employability in the course of their NYC experience. Employability gains were primarily associated with improvements in the general areas of character, attitude and behavior.

About one-third of the enrollees in the Prospective study left their first NYC enrollments for activities consonant with program objectives (jobs, further training, or school), and for which relevant identifying information was supplied (names and/or addresses). An additional 16 percent of the male subjects were reported to have exited toward employment that was not specified by employer's name or location. About two-thirds of the enrollees terminated prematurely so far as planned-for post-NYC activities were concerned. Factors in premature terminations included maladjustments to the NYC, the desire to get non-NYC employment, and situations not directly related to NYC experience--for example, health, family problems, moving, and the like. Most of the premature terminations were initiated by enrollees.

The NYC experience of relatively few subjects in the Prospective study involved re-assignment and re-enrollment. Data describing the experience of these subjects indicated that re-assignment and re-enrollment tended to be associated with poor initial adjustment to the NYC experience--particularly with female enrollees--and to be associated with improved NYC experience.

Site differences in reported program experience were often apparent. These differences did not lend themselves to summarization, because of their variety and because the numbers of subjects associated with apparent differences were often so small as to caution against drawing conclusions. Results from a number of sections of the data indicated that the Cincinnati program was working particularly well with female enrollees; while, in some respects, the East St. Louis program seemed to be working particularly well with male enrollees. Compared to the other programs, the Durham program was most apt to involve male enrollees in remedial education; but the work experience of Durham male enrollees seemed, in a number of respects, to be limited in its potential to enhance employability. For female enrollees, clerical work assignments were more often reported than any other kind of assignment in every site except Durham. In Durham, female enrollees were more often assigned to human service-type work. In St. Louis, differences associated with the sex of the subject tended to be minimized and the program provided more variegated work experience for both male and female subjects than was the case in the other sites.

The observations reported in this chapter were based on program-sourced data. Follow-up information, reported in the next chapters, will indicate the extent to which perceptions of effectiveness at the time of termination squared with actual achievements of improved adjustments to society and the world of work.

V

NYC Experience--Enrollee Reports

Follow-up interviews in the longitudinal studies of this research contained a number of questions relating to NYC experience. These questions, of course, involved only the subjects in Experimental study groups--the subjects who had been enrolled in the NYC. The responses of enrollee-subjects to questions about their NYC experience are reported in this chapter.

In their reports of NYC experience, most of the enrollee-subjects described events that had occurred in the past (see Table 5.1). The retrospective character of much of this information may have blurred some objective details--for example, the duration of NYC enrollments--and may have affected some subjective data--for example, estimates of the usefulness of NYC experience. In terms of the extent of retrospection--the average time elapsed between NYC experience and the time of interview information--second-round interviewing in the Retrospective study was about midway between first-round Prospective results (about five months further from NYC experience). Because enrollee-subjects had comparatively little post-NYC time in Prospective I (18 percent were still in the NYC at the time of interview), subjects in Control study groups were not interviewed in this phase of the Prospective study. Prospective II results, on the other hand, included both study groups, but subjects in one site--East St. Louis--were not interviewed.

TABLE 5.1

MEAN MONTHS IN THE NYC, MEAN MONTHS SINCE NYC, AND TOTAL MEAN TIME SPAN, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY STUDY AND SITE

Study and Site	In NYC	Since NYC[a]	Total
		Mean Months	
Retrospective II			
Cincinnati	11.4	14.2	25.6
Durham	13.3	11.6	24.9
East St. Louis	10.5	15.2	25.7
St. Louis	10.8	13.3	24.1
All Sites	11.5	13.4	24.9
Prospective I			
Cincinnati	9.0	10.6	19.6
Durham	11.4	11.1	22.5
East St. Louis	13.3	7.1	20.4
St. Louis	11.0	8.0	19.0
All Sites	10.8	9.3	20.1
Prospective II			
Cincinnati	10.5	21.0	31.5
Durham	12.6	21.3	33.9
St. Louis	13.2	17.8	31.0
All Sites	11.8	20.3	32.1

---

[a] Months between leaving the NYC and, in Retrospective II, date of interview; in Prospective I, July 1, 1968; and, in Prospective II, July 1, 1969.

Length of NYC Experience

Compared to female subjects, male subjects in the second round of interviewing in the Prospective study reported three months less, on the average, of NYC experience and they were twice as apt to have left the program with one month, or less, of NYC experience (see Table 5.2). These results were consistent with other enrollee reports of the length of NYC experience that were obtained in the course of this research. In the second round of interviewing in the Retrospective study, for example, male subjects also averaged about three months less of NYC experience; and the proportion of male subjects leaving the NYC with six months or less of experience was nearly double that of female subjects (see Table 5.3). In the first round of interviewing in the Prospective study, also, male subjects averaged 2.5 months less of NYC experience, and significantly more male subjects left the NYC with six months, or less, of program experience. In Prospective I, nine percent of the male subjects, and 22 percent of the female subjects, were actively enrolled in the NYC at the time of interview. The longer NYC experience of these subjects was reflected in the Prospective II results.

TABLE 5.2

MONTHS IN THE NYC, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX

Months	Male N=64	Female N=212
	Percent	
1 month, or less	29%	13%
2-6 months	22	17
7-9 months	14	18
10-12 months	13	15
13-36 months	23	36
TOTAL	101%	101%
Mean months of NYC experience	9.4	12.6
Enrolled in NYC at time of interview (percent)	0%	5%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(3)

TABLE 5.3

MONTHS IN THE NYC, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SEX

	Retrospective II		Prospective I	
Months	Male N=141	Female N=247	Male N=89	Female N=251
6 months or less	41%	22%	47%	33%
7-12 months	36	40	24	32
13 months or more	22	36	30	36
TOTAL	99%	98%	101%	101%
Mean months of NYC experience	9.7	12.6	9.0	11.5
Enrolled in NYC at time of interview (percent)	7%	12%	9%	22%
Unknown (number)	(5)	(5)	(1)	(1)

The relationships between length of NYC experience and program effectiveness were explored in the Retrospective study through a comparison of subjects who had made "successful" and "unsuccessful" adjustments to the world of work. Among male subjects, "successful" enrollees averaged significantly shorter NYC experience (7.9 months) than "unsuccessful" enrollees (11.8 months).[1] Among female subjects, however, "successful" and "unsuccessful" enrollees did not differ significantly with respect to their average NYC experience (12.7 months, as compared with 12.0 months).

---

[1] See Retrospective II report, page 109, Table 73.

The significantly longer NYC experience of "unsuccessful" male subjects, indicated that nearly a year's experience had not substantially reduced the employability problems of these subjects, while the shorter NYC experience of "succuessful" male subjects suggested less severe employability handicaps among these subjects. Perhaps a number of those males who had enrolled only briefly regarded their NYC work assignments as interim jobs which could be obtained quickly and easily when they were unable to find immediate employment elsewhere. The longer NYC experience of "successful" female subjects, compared to male subjects, suggested either that young women have more difficulty finding employment or that they found the NYC program more attractive; and the substantially similar extents of NYC experience among both "successful" and "unsuccessful" female enrollees indicated that factors other than length of experience had a more significant effect on outcomes.

Although, in each site, the NYC experience of male subjects was shorter, on the average, than that of female subjects, differences between sites were sometimes more pronounced than differences between sexes (see Table 5.4). Prospective Study II results indicated that male subjects in Cincinnati had the shortest NYC experience--these subjects averaged 8.0 months of NYC experience, 3.4 months less, on the average, than female subjects in Cincinnati, and 4.2 months less, on the average, than male subjects in St. Louis. Prospective I results also showed the shortest average NYC experiences in Cincinnati. The highest average months spent in the NYC was found in East St. Louis--11.8 months among male subjects, and 14.1 months among female subjects--with the average time in the NYC reported by male subjects exceeding the average NYC time reported by female subjects in the other sites. These results are probably due to fewer employment opportunities in East St. Louis.

TABLE 5.4

NYC EXPERIENCE, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDIES I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Sites and Variables	Prospective I		Prospective II	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Cincinnati (number)	(32)	(78)	(33)	(84)
Mean months in the NYC	6.0	10.2	8.0	11.4
In the NYC 6 months or less (percent)	63%	40%	54%	32%
In the NYC at time of interview (percent)	9%	17%	0%	2%
Durham (number)	(13)	(62)	(15)	(70)
Mean months in the NYC	9.9	11.7	9.7	13.2
In the NYC 6 months or less (percent)	46%	34%	47%	30%
In the NYC at time of interview (percent)	0%	18%	0%	6%
St. Louis (number)	(24)	(72)	(16)	(58)
Mean months in the NYC	10.2	11.3	12.2	13.4
In the NYC 6 months or less (percent)	38%	32%	47%	29%
In the NYC at time of interview (percent)	13%	21%	0%	7%
East St. Louis[a] (number)	(19)	(38)		
Mean months in the NYC	11.8	14.1		
In the NYC 6 months or less (percent)	32%	18%		
In the NYC at time of interview (percent)	5%	22%		

[a] East St. Louis was not included in Prospective II interviewing.

In summary, the inability to retain male enrollees for periods long enough to allow substantial program inputs was an apparent program weakness. The generally shorter NYC experience of male enrollees precluded the expectation of any NYC effect for many of these subjects. At the same time, study results indicated that male enrollees with longer NYC experience did not thereby achieve substantially enhanced employability. For both male and female enrollees, then, length of NYC experience was not associated with a better post-NYC outcome indicating that increased program effectiveness with both male and female enrollees might be primarily a matter of improving the quality of the NYC experience.

Number of NYC Enrollments

In the composite Experimental study group in Prospective Study II, there was no substantial difference between male and female subjects with respect to the number of NYC enrollments that they reported (see Table 5.5). Subjects of each sex averaged 1.4 NYC enrollments, and most subjects (70 percent of all male subjects, and 65 percent of all female subjects) reported only one NYC enrollment. Subjects in St. Louis tended to report more NYC enrollments than subjects in other sites, with the difference being particularly striking for female subjects. Female subjects in St. Louis reported, on the average, 1.6 NYC enrollments and only 54 percent of them reported a single NYC enrollment. Multiple NYC enrollments were significantly more frequent among female subjects in St. Louis than among female subjects in Cincinnati.

TABLE 5.5

NUMBER OF NYC ENROLLMENTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Site and Enrollment	Male	Female
Cincinnati (number reporting)	(33)	(80)
Mean number of NYC enrollments	1.4	1.3
One NYC enrollment (percent)	73%	75%
Durham (number reporting)	(15)	(66)
Mean number of NYC enrollments	1.3	1.5
One NYC enrollment (percent)	73%	64%
St. Louis (number reporting)	(16)	(56)
Mean number of NYC enrollments	1.5	1.6
One NYC enrollment (percent)	63%	54%
All sites (number reporting)	(64)	(202)
Mean number of NYC enrollments	1.4	1.4
One NYC enrollment (percent)	70%	65%

These results may have indicated that the St. Louis NYC was generally more apt to maintain involvement with enrollees who left the program before achieving employability. Other results of this research suggested that the re-enrollment of prematurely-separated enrollees might be an important factor in program effectiveness.[1] Although re-enrollment, in itself, primarily indicated an earlier program separation that had not resulted in satisfactory work adjustments, the fact that nearly half of the female subjects and more than one-third of the male subjects in St. Louis got another chance to enhance their employability through the NYC suggested sustained enrollee contact in this site as much as preceding NYC enrollments that had not eventuated in satisfactory employment adjustments.

[1] See, for example, Termination Study Report, p. 84.

Kind of NYC Work

Male enrollee-subjects most frequently (52 percent) reported most recent NYC work assignments in Indoor or Outdoor Maintenance work, while female enrollee-subjects most frequently (47 percent) reported assignments in Clerical work (see Table 5.6). Both male and female subjects reported NYC assignments in Health work to about the same extent (17 percent and 20 percent, respectively), and assignments involving work with professionals or semi-professionals was reported more frequently by female subjects (17 percent) than by male subjects (nine percent). Although the skill-training potential of these most recent NYC assignments could be expected to vary considerably with work-site conditions, these results generally indicated that female enrollees were more apt to have NYC work-experience connoting specific vocational skills than were male enrollees. Almost all of the specific vocational training provided for female enrollees, however, was in the Clerical field.

Compared to Retrospective II results, the most recent NYC work assignments of male enrollee-subjects in the Prospective II results showed a reduction in Maintenance and Food assignments and an increase in assignments involving work in a professional setting (see Table 5.7).

Comparisons of the kind of work reported for the last NYC assignment and for the first post-NYC job indicated that the first jobs of male subjects tended to be "better" than their last NYC assignments, while the first jobs of female subjects tended to be "worse." Although the occupational categories involved were somewhat approximate, these contrary tendencies were clearly indicated in the Skilled Manual category for male subjects (six percent of NYC assignments, and 17 percent of first jobs), and in the Clerical category for female subjects (47 percent of NYC assignments, and 30 percent of first jobs).

TABLE 5.6

NYC WORK IN MOST RECENT NYC ASSIGNMENT, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Kind of NYC Work	Male N=64	Female N=212
	Percent	
Clerical Office work, office machines, sales, clerical aide	11%	47%
Indoor Maintenance Janitorial work, housekeeping, guard work, custodial aide, maintenance aide	36	9
Outdoor Maintenance Roadside improvement, street cleaning, beautification aide, conservation aide	16	0
Food Food preparation or service, kitchen work, cook, cook's helper	5	4
Health Work with patients, hospital aide, nurses' aide	17	20
Work in association with professionals or semi-professionals Block worker, social service, activity leader, lab assistant, education aide, nursery school aide, library aide, recreation aide, program aide, pharmacy aide	9	17
Work in association with technicians, craftsmen, machine operators Photography, printing, electrical maintenance, dressmaker, seamstress, drivers' aide, X-ray machine operator, Electrocardiogram machine operator	6	2
TOTAL	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(5)

TABLE 5.7

OCCUPATION, MOST RECENT NYC ASSIGNMENT, COMPARISON[a] OF RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II RESULTS SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SEX

Occupation	Male Retro. II N=99	Male Pro. II N=64	Female Retro. II N=217	Female Pro. II N=212
Clerical	6%	11%	41%	47%
Technician, Skilled Manual, Machine Operator	7	6	2	2
Semi-skilled work in a professional setting, including Health Work	11	26	39	37
Unskilled work, including indoor and outdoor maintenance and food	76	57	18	13
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(4)	(5)

[a] Retrospective II results for Cincinnati, Durham, and St. Louis compared with Prospective II results in these sites.

It will be noted that one site, East St. Louis, was not reflected in Table 5.7. Since this site did not figure in Prospective II results, comparisons of the composite Prospective II Experimental group with composite Experimental groups in other research units required the deletion of East St. Louis results from these 4-site composite groups. Comparison of Retrospective II and Prospective I results in East St. Louis indicated that NYC assignments for male enrollees had improved in the Prospective study in that the proportion of assignments connoting some specific vocational skill increased while the proportion of assignments to maintenance work decreased. Among female enrollees, the most frequently reported

NYC assignment in both Retrospective and Prospective studies involved clerical work, with the proportion declining slightly in the Prospective study and the proportion of maintenance and food work increasing.

These results indicated that (1) even though the vocational potential of work assignments for male enrollees had improved, NYC assignments for young men less often connoted opportunity to acquire specific vocational skills than did NYC assignments for young women, and (2) the vocational potential connoted in assignments for young women was apt to be unrealized (at least, immediately) in the job world.

It should be borne in mind that interview results provided a limited picture of NYC experience. Only the most recent NYC assignment of interviewed subjects, for example, was reflected in the above results; but many enrollees had several assignments in the course of their NYC enrollments and some enrollees had several NYC enrollments.

Participation in Special NYC Courses

Study subjects were asked whether they had taken part in "any special NYC education or training courses in addition to the work program." This question was designed to pick up program experience additional to work-training--remedial or supplementary education, special vocational training, and participation in group sessions related to preparations for life and the world of work.

Second-round interviews in the Prospective study indicated (see Table 5.8) that most subjects did not participate in any special courses, with male subjects reporting more non-participation (78 percent) than female subjects (63 percent). Most frequently, subjects who reported participation in special NYC classes or courses participated in educational classes only; and very few reported vocational courses. Some subjects, however--26 in all--reported educational classes and vocational courses. Most of these subjects (22) were participants in the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op--a formal skill training program almost exclusively used by female enrollees.

TABLE 5.8

PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL EDUCATION OR TRAINING COURSES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX

Participation and Course	Male N=64	Female N=205
	Percent	
Did not participate in any special courses	78%	63%
Participated in special courses:		
Educational classes only[a]	17	21
Vocational training courses only[a]	2	3
Educational classes and vocational courses[b]	4	11
Special courses only	0	0
TOTAL	101%	98%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)

[a] Includes special courses (e.g., "grooming" or "hygiene") when reported with class or course work. Undescribed courses assumed to be educational.

[b] Includes participants in Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op program.

Prospective II results were generally similar to Retrospective II results (see Table 5.9) in that most subjects did not report participation in special NYC courses and in that most participation involved remedial education. Changes between participation percentages in the two studies indicated that participation of male subjects was higher in the later phases of the program reflected in the Prospective study. In the composite 4-site Experimental group, the participation of male subjects was up by eight percentage points in the Prospective study, and the percentage of education participation had doubled from nine percent (in the Retrospective study) to 20 percent (in the Prospective study). The composite 3-site Experimental group also showed approximately the same increase in participation, but comparatively less of the increase occurred in education.

TABLE 5.9

PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL NYC COURSES, SELECTED VARIABLES, COMPARISONS BETWEEN RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE STUDIES, BY SEX

Study and Variables	Male	Female
Retrospective II, 4 Sites (Number reporting)	(133)	(243)
Participated in special NYC courses (percent)	12%	37%
Participated in NYC education (percent)	9%	24%
Prospective I, 4 Sites (Number reporting)	(87)	(246)
Participated in special NYC courses (percent)	23%	30%
Participated in NYC education (percent)	20%	22%
Retrospective II, 3 Sites (Number reporting)[a]	(96)	(214)
Participated in special NYC courses (percent)	14%	41%
Participated in NYC education (percent)	11%	17%
Prospective II, 3 Sites (Number reporting)[a]	(64)	(202)
Participated in special NYC courses (percent)	23%	35%
Participated in NYC education (percent)	17%	21%

[a] The three sites reflected in Prospective II were Cincinnati, Durham, and St. Louis. To afford comparison with Retrospective II, 3-site results in this study have been presented.

Among female subjects, the percent of subjects reporting participation was smaller in the Prospective study than in the Retrospective study. The proportion of female subjects reporting participation in NYC education was somewhat smaller in the 4-site Prospective I results (17 percent, as compared with 24 percent) and somewhat larger in the 3-site Prospective II results (21 percent, as compared with 17 percent).

The differences between the participation pictures in the two studies reflected site changes (see Table 5.10) of several kinds. In the two larger sites--Cincinnati and St. Louis--the participation of male subjects was very substantially larger in the Prospective study. Compared to participation reported in the Retrospective study, male participation was up 300 percent in both metropolitan sites, with the proportion of male participation in St. Louis being about three times that in Cincinnati in both studies. In Durham, on the other hand, the proportion of male participation in special NYC courses decreased from 35 percent in the Retrospective study to 20 percent in the Prospective study, and in East St. Louis, the proportion of male participation was very small in both studies (five percent). Among female subjects, comparisons between Prospective and Retrospective results showed that participation was up in Cincinnati, down in Durham and East St. Louis, and the same in St. Louis.

TABLE 5.10

PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL NYC COURSES[a], RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SEX AND SITE

Site	Male				Female			
	Retro. II		Pro. II		Retro. II		Pro. II	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Cincinnati	(57)	4%	(33)	12%	(64)	25%	(80)	42%
Durham	(26)	35%	(15)	20%	(63)	46%	(65)	18%
St. Louis	(13)	15%	(16)	44%	(87)	49%	(57)	49%
East St. Louis[b]	(37)	5%	(20)	5%	(29)	10%	(39)	0%

[a] Percent of subjects reporting (N) who reported participation in special NYC courses or classes.

[b] Prospective I results in East St. Louis. Subjects in East St. Louis were not interviewed in Prospective II. Prospective I interviews were at least half a year earlier than Prospective II interviews, and more of the subjects were in the NYC in Prospective I. In East St. Louis, five percent of the male subjects, and 22 percent of the female subjects, were in the NYC at the time of Prospective I interviews. Their perceptions of NYC experience might, therefore, tend to reflect more recent NYC experience than the perceptions of enrollees interviewed in Prospective II.

These results indicated that both the Cincinnati and the St. Louis NYC's had been able to increase the participation of male enrollees in program activities additional to work-training (primarily remedial education) in the later phases of their operations. The Durham program (which had gotten off to a good start), on the other hand, had apparently become less effective in this respect; and the East St. Louis program showed no development. As a result of program developments, the extent of participation reported in the Prospective study was approximately the same for male and female subjects in three sites. In Cincinnati, however, the extent of participation by male subjects was less than one-third that of female subjects. In this site, the Clerical Co-Op was a major factor in the increased participation of female subjects.

NYC Counseling

The counseling component of NYC experience was structured on the standard procedure of assigning each enrollee to a counselor or work advisor--an NYC staff member who served as liaison between other NYC program components and the enrollee. The enrollee's participation in NYC work experience and educational programs, for example, would be monitored by the counselor who, as necessary, would counsel the enrollee towards improved participation and/or revise the enrollee's NYC assignments in order to facilitate improved participation. Counselor assignments were ordinarily in terms of the location of the enrollee's work assignment, with counselors of enrollees in large worksites (such as hospitals) having all of their caseload in one site, and with counselors of enrollees in small worksites traveling from site to site in order to maintain contact with their enrollees. Counselors ordinarily transmitted the enrollees' time sheets to the program's payroll section. The standard procedures of counselor assignment, as well as the basic counselor function of forwarding time sheets, assured routine meetings with counselors for most enrollees who stayed in the NYC as long as one month. The counseling content of these meetings might, however, be negligible when the enrollee's problems were not salient.

More substantial counseling inputs, growing out of the standard format of counselor contact, could be expected when the enrollee experienced difficulties. Problems connected with the work assignment, for example, would normally be aired in the course of routine meetings or--in worksites with resident counselors--as they occurred. The fact that each enrollee was in contact with a counselor, furthermore, facilitated counseling in other areas--other areas of NYC participation, and in general personal areas.

In addition to individual counseling sessions, group counseling meetings often figured in NYC experience. NYC group counseling could range from discussion sessions on such topics as "Good Grooming," "Job Etiquette," or "Personal Hygiene" to professional group therapy sessions. The latter depended, of course, on the availability of personnel trained as therapists (in one instance, a psychiatrist attached to a hospital worksite). In general, however, NYC counselors were not trained as therapists, and the counsel that they provided was that of the concerned layman who, in the course of his work, was increasingly knowledgeable about the problems of NYC enrollees.

The counseling component of NYC experience was more varied and amorphous than the work experience and educational components. In trying to get the enrollee's impression of NYC counseling, several kinds of questions were used. The question concerning participation in special NYC programs, for example, picked up some reflections of group counseling experiences. Counseling was also investigated with questions concerning extent and content. Round-1 interviews in the Prospective study attempted to discriminate between substantial counseling sessions and minimum or routine counselor contact by using two questions: "How often did you meet with your counselor to discuss problems?" and "How often did you meet with him otherwise?" Results (see Table 7.11) indicated that routine meetings often combined with problem discussions, and that enrollees in St. Louis tended to see their counselors more frequently than enrollees in other sites.

TABLE 5.11

FREQUENCY OF COUNSELOR MEETINGS FOR PROBLEM DISCUSSIONS AND OTHER PURPOSES PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX AND SITE

Frequency	Cin'ti.		Durham		E. St. Louis		St. Louis	
	Pro.	Other	Pro.	Other	Pro.	Other	Pro.	Other
Male Subjects (N)	(30)		(13)		(20)		(22)	
Once a week or oftener	20%	20%	31%	69%	45%	50%	81%	68%
Less than once a week through once a month	60%	53%	53%	31%	45%	45%	9%	14%
Less than once a month	3%	10%	8%	0%	5%	0%	5%	5%
Not at all	17%	17%	8%	0%	5%	5%	5%	14%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%
Female Subjects (N)	(78)		(60)		(38)		(71)	
Once a week or oftener	18%	31%	47%	54%	39%	36%	86%	68%
Less than once a week through once a month	66%	43%	33%	32%	39%	43%	8%	14%
Less than once a month	12%	13%	12%	8%	5%	3%	1%	3%
Not at all	5%	13%	8%	7%	16%	18%	4%	15%
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	101%	99%	100%	99%	100%

The results of round-1 Prospective study interviewing with respect to frequency of meetings with counselor indicated some differences apparently associated with site and some differences apparently associated with sex, but the differences were not consistent. These results also indicated that most meetings with counselors combined what the enrollees considered to be routine contacts with discussions of problems. Distinctions between counseling meetings in terms of purpose were, therefore, somewhat artificial; and, in subsequent interviews, the distinction between counselor meetings for the purpose of problem discussion and meetings for other purposes was abandoned.

Comparison of second-round interviews in the Retrospective and Prospective studies (see Table 5.12) showed that very significantly more subjects in the Retrospective study reported never having met with an NYC counselor. These subjects, enrollees in the earliest months of NYC operations, were either in the program so short a time as not to have had regular counselor contact or had been unable to distinguish counselor contact as such. In the Prospective study, reflecting later enrollments, study subjects were far more apt to report counselor meetings of some frequency.

TABLE 5.12

FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS WITH COUNSELOR, EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX

Frequency	Male Retro. II N=97	Male Pro. II N=64	Female Retro. II N=214	Female Pro. II N=205
			Percent	
Once a week, or oftener	31%	54%	48%	60%
Less than once a week through once a month	29%	27%	25%	29%
Less than once a month	11%	14%	8%	9%
Not at all	28%	5%	18%	2%
TOTAL[a]	99%	100%	99%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(3)

[a] Three-site total. East St. Louis omitted in order to obtain comparability with three-site total in Prospective II.

Considering only those subjects who reported some frequency of meetings with NYC counselors (see Table 5.13), and comparing results from the second round interviews in the Retrospective and Prospective studies, subjects in St. Louis were more apt than subjects in other sites to report counselor meetings at least as frequently as once a week. This difference was particularly marked in the Prospective results which showed nine out of ten St. Louis subjects reporting counselor meetings at least once a week. Although the numbers involved were often small, these results indicated significant site differences in the enrollees' perceptions of the frequency with which they saw their NYC counselors.

Following the question concerning frequency of counselor meetings, study subjects were asked, "When you met with your counselor, what did you talk about?" Interviewers were instructed to probe and to indicate all areas reported. As might be expected, St. Louis with its more frequent counselor meetings produced more kinds of talk (see Table 5.14). On the other hand, the comparatively infrequent counselor meetings in Cincinnati were also quite comprehensive with male subjects reporting 2.6 discussion areas, on the average, and female subjects reporting 2.5 discussion areas, on the average. Durham subjects averaged the fewest reported discussion areas and were most apt to report counseling focussed on the NYC work experience. Almost all of the Durham male subjects described counseling content limited to NYC jobs; and most of the Durham female subjects, also, described counseling primarily in the context of work experience. In the two larger sites, counseling areas were very much more apt to include discussions relating to education, health, family or personal problems, and post-NYC employment.

TABLE 5.13

FREQUENCY OF MEETING WITH NYC COUNSELOR, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND SITE

Frequency	Cincinnati RII	Cincinnati PII	Durham RII	Durham PII	St. Louis RII	St. Louis PII
Male Subjects (Number reporting)[a]	(38)	(30)	(21)	(14)	(10)	(16)
	Percent		Percent		Percent	
Once a week, or more often	32%	37%	52%	57%	70%	94%
Less often than once a week, through once a month	45	37	33	36	30	6
Less than once a month	24	27	10	7	0	0
TOTAL	101%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Female Subjects (Number reporting)[a]	(41)	(78)	(61)	(64)	(72)	(56)
	Percent		Percent		Percent	
Once a week, or more often	22%	32%	67%	67%	74%	93%
Less often than once a week, through once a month	46	46	30	30	24	7
Less than once a month	32	22	3	3	3	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	100%

---

[a] Number reporting some meetings with counselor (i.e., None and Unknown excluded.)

TABLE 5.14

TOPICS DISCUSSED WITH COUNSELOR, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SEX AND SITE

Topics and Sex	Cin'ti	Durham	St. Louis	All Sites
Male Subjects (number)	(33)	(15)	(16)	(64)
NYC assignments and policies	55%	67%	81%	65%
Problems on NYC job	45	75	75	60
Education	45	17	50	40
Health	28%	0%	31%	23%
Family, personal problems, general	34	0	38	28
Employment outside the NYC	55%	0%	38%	39%
TOTAL[a]	262%	159%	313%	255%
Talked about "nothing", did not meet with counselor, and unknown (number)	(4)	(3)	(0)	(7)
Female Subjects (number)	(80)	(68)	(57)	(205)
NYC assignments and policies	71%	54%	81%	66%
Problems on NYC job	64	59	68	64
Education	33	26	64	40
Health	6%	2%	39%	14%
Family, personal problems, general	32	21	27	27
Employment outside the NYC	40%	7%	63%	36%
TOTAL[a]	246%	169%	334%	247%
Talked about "nothing", did not meet with counselor, and unknown (number)	(2)	(7)	(1)	(10)

[a] Subjects could report more than one topic.

Compared to the counseling areas reported by subjects in the 4-site Retrospective II study, male subjects in the 4-site Prospective I study (see Table 5.15) reported more areas of counsel, on the average, with the increase reflecting increased counsel primarily associated with work-training. Among female subjects, the average number of areas of counsel was about the same in the two studies, with the Prospective I results showing an increase in counsel associated with work-training offset by a decrease in counsel associated with family or personal problems. In general, the composite study group results indicated that the counseling component had been stepped up, particularly with respect to counsel associated with NYC work-training, as the programs developed. On the whole, also, enrollee reports of counseling topics indicated that the scope of counseling received by male subjects was about the same as that received by female subjects--particularly in the most-recent phases of program operation.

Compared to the other sites, Durham delivered the least comprehensive counseling in terms of average number of counseling topics discussed, and Durham enrollee reports did not indicate that the scope of counseling increased as the program developed. In both the Retrospective and Prospective studies, however, Durham--like the other sites--emphasized counseling associated with NYC participation.

TABLE 5.15

TOPICS DISCUSSED WITH COUNSELOR, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY I, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, BY SEX

Topics	Male		Female	
	R II N=141	P I N=89	R II N=247	P I N=256
NYC Assignments and policies	49%	63%	54%	59%
Problems on NYC job	37	63	55	66
Education	33	32	44	44
Health	6%	12%	19%	17%
Family, personal problems, general	17	24	36	24
Employment outside the NYC	48%	37%	39%	40%
TOTAL[a]	190%	231%	247%	250%
No report, including no meetings with counselor (number)	(15)	(11)	(10)	(22)

[a] Subjects could report more than one topic.

It was of interest that expectations of sex-differentiated counseling content, reflecting sex-differentiated areas of possible counseling needs, were not generally supported by enrollees' reports of counseling. The expectation that male enrollees with their greater educational deficiencies might report more counseling concerned with education was supported in only one site result: in the Prospective II results, 45 percent of the male subjects in Cincinnati, as compared with 33 percent of the female subjects, reported education as a topic discussed with their counselors. In other site results, there was either no apparent difference between reports from male and female subjects in this respect or—more often--female subjects more frequently reported counseling concerned with education.

Similarly, the expectation that female enrollees might more frequently report counsel concerned with family or personal problems--based on the more extensive family problems of female enrollees--was not supported in the composite Prospective study results. While the proportion of female enrollees reporting counsel in this area was often somewhat higher than that of male enrollees in a given site/study result, when the generally higher rate of female response and other Prospective Study results were taken into account the difference was slight. Unlike the counseling results with respect to education, counseling results with respect to family or personal problems indicated that the problems of male enrollees in this area were, perhaps, as extensive as those of female enrollees.

Counseling concerned with employment outside the NYC was least often reported by Durham subjects--particularly in the Prospective study. Counseling in this area might be expected to increase near the end of NYC experience and, thus, might tend to be less frequently reported in Prospective I results (when more of the subjects were still in the NYC). Compared to Retrospective II results, Prospective II results indicated that counseling in this area had tended to increase in the two larger sites, particularly in St. Louis, but had not increased in Durham.

Perceptions of NYC Experience

Subjects were asked to rate a number of aspects of NYC experience, and to explain their ratings. All of the ratings were on 5-point scales running from least (1) to most(5) of the aspect being rated; and, regardless of study or sex, subjects tended to rate the NYC highly (see Table 5.16). With the exception of "Closeness of Supervision" ratings, both male and female subjects in the 4-site Retrospective II interviews and in the 4-site Prospective I interviews produced average ratings of 4.0, or above, in each of the rated aspects. On most scales, female subjects averaged higher ratings than did male subjects. Although the extent of the difference was often too small to indicate statistical significance, the consistency with which female subjects produced higher averages suggested that they tended to view the NYC with more enthusiasm than male subjects--liking their NYC work more, thinking it more important, and considering program personnel more helpful.

Again, with the exception of "Closeness of Supervision" ratings and, among male subjects, "Liking for NYC Work" ratings, average ratings in 3-site Prospective I interviews and 3-site Prospective II interviews were 4.0, or above, for both male and female subjects in all scales. As with the 4-site results, female subjects tended to produce higher average ratings than did male subjects. The similarities between average ratings at different times suggested that the later phases of NYC program operations (reflected in Prospective results) were as well-received as earlier phases (reflected in Retrospective results); and that the passage of time did not alter the ratings to any substantial extent.

The generally high average ratings of various aspects of NYC experience also suggested that the ratings may have reflected generalized attitudes towards the program rather than specific, discriminated aspects of experience. The fact that "Closeness of Supervision" produced averages nearer the mid-point of the scale (neither too loose nor too strict) than the top of the scale (as was the case with most other ratings) indicated, however, that subjects were discriminating in their responses. At the same

TABLE 5.16

MEAN RATINGS OF ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE[a], SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY II AND PROSPECTIVE STUDY I AND II, BY SEX

Aspect of NYC Experience	Retro II		Prosp I[b]		Prosp I[c]		Prosp II	
Male Subjects	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Liking for NYC work	(135)	4.2	(86)	4.1	(66)	4.1	(63)	3.9
Importance of NYC work	(136)	4.0	(85)	4.1	(66)	4.0	(63)	4.1
Friendliness of fellow-workers	(133)	4.7	(85)	4.4	(65)	4.4	(63)	4.5
Closeness of supervision	(135)	3.6	(85)	3.6	(65)	3.5	(63)	3.3
Helpfulness of work supervisor	(136)	4.2	(85)	4.1	(66)	4.1	(62)	4.1
Helpfulness of counselor	(135)	4.0	(85)	4.1	(66)	4.0	(63)	4.0
Overall usefulness of NYC	(135)	4.1	(85)	4.3	(65)	4.3	(63)	4.0
Female Subjects								
Liking for NYC work	(246)	4.4	(250)	4.4	(211)	4.4	(200)	4.5
Importance of NYC work	(246)	4.4	(249)	4.5	(210)	4.5	(200)	4.4
Friendliness of fellow-workers	(245)	4.5	(249)	4.5	(211)	4.5	(201)	4.4
Closeness of supervision	(244)	3.7	(249)	3.6	(210)	3.6	(200)	3.6
Helpfulness of work supervisor	(245)	4.2	(250)	4.3	(212)	4.3	(200)	4.2
Helpfulness of counselor	(242)	4.1	(249)	4.1	(211)	4.2	(200)	4.2
Overall usefulness of NYC	(244)	4.5	(251)	4.5	(212)	4.5	(207)	4.4

[a] Ratings on 5-point scale running from "least" (1) to "most" (5). For example, in the scale for liking of NYC work, the values ran from "Not at all" (1) to "Very much" (5).

[b] First-round interviews in 4 sites, comparable to second-round interviews in Retrospective study.

[c] First-round interview in 3 site, comparable to second-round interviews in Prospective study.

time, many of the areas rated, overlapped so that ratings in one aspect of experience (for example, helpfulness of personnel) could contribute to ratings in another aspect of experience (for example, usefulness of NYC). The contexts of the ratings, indicated by the reasons, explanations, or illustrations accompanying the ratings, were thus as important as the ratings themselves in the investigation of the enrollees' views of the NYC.

Liking for NYC Work

Study subjects were asked to rate their liking for NYC work on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all" (1) to "Very much" (5). In the composite Experimental group of Prospective Study II (see Table 5.17), the average ratings of male subjects (3.9) were very significantly lower than the average ratings of female subjects (4.5). In each site, furthermore, the average ratings of male subjects were lower than those of female subjects, although site differences in this respect were large enough to be statistically significant only in St. Louis.

TABLE 5.17

MEAN LIKE NYC WORK RATINGS,[a] PROSPECTIVE STUDY II,
SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(33)	3.9	(79)	4.3
Durham	(14)	4.4	(66)	4.7
St. Louis	(16)	3.7	(55)	4.4
All Sites	(63)	3.9	(200)	4.5

[a] Mean of rating on 5-point scale running from "Not at all" (1) to "Very much" (5).

After they had rated their liking for NYC work, study subjects were asked to explain why they had rated the program as they did. The unstructured responses to this question were organized according to their critical or approbative character, and then roughly categorized according to content (see Table 5.18). Enjoyment of the work activity itself was the principal component of approbative responses: among male subjects, 83 percent of the reasons were approbative and 40 percent indicated enjoyment of the work itself; and, among female subjects, 90 percent of the reasons were approbative and 46 percent indicated enjoyment of the work itself.

These results suggested that, in general, like-NYC-work ratings reflected total NYC experience and enjoyment of NYC work was a major factor in the approbation of the program by both male and female enrollees. The character of work assignments for male enrollees sometimes may have had a dampening effect on their like-NYC-work ratings, reducing the degree, but not the extent, of program approbation. The reasons for like-NYC-work ratings suggested that the NYC experience tended to be valued in itself rather than in comparison to non-NYC jobs or as a means of preparing for non-NYC jobs. Although the career potential of NYC experience may have played a part in positive appreciations of the program, lack of career potential did not appear to have affected the ratings to any great extent, and the limitations of NYC work (short pay but short hours, for example) were not necessarily reasons for not liking the NYC experience.

TABLE 5.18

REASONS FOR LIKE-NYC-WORK RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II[a], SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX

Reasons	Male N=64	Female N=212
	Percent	
Negative		
Career (post-NYC) value or interest--"didn't teach me anything," "no future," "didn't get me a job."	5%	1%
The work itself--"didn't like working around sick people," "dirty," "uninteresting," "nothing to do."	10	3
Program conditions--"not a full-time job," "didn't pay enough," "favoritism," "discrimination."	2	4
Reiteration--"didn't like it."	2	2
Positive		
Career--"showed me how I could get a job and keep it," "Good training," "teaches responsibility," "interest."	21%	27%
The work itself--"like the work," "like to work with cars," "enjoy working with people who need me."	40	46
Program conditions--"liked the hours," "liked supervisor," "educational features," "earn money."	16	7
Reiteration--"It was OK," "Anything is better than nothing."	6	10
TOTAL	102%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(7)
Mean Like-NYC-Work Rating	3.9	4.5

[a] East St. Louis not included in Prospective Study II results.

It was of interest that Durham--the smallest program in the Prospective Study II--produced the highest average like-NYC-work ratings. Durham also produced the highest average ratings in Prospective Study I (see Table 5.19) with East St. Louis, another comparatively small site, producing second-highest average ratings. These results might suggest that size of program was a factor in like-NYC-work ratings, with the smaller programs tending to achieve more positive program responses than large, metropolitan programs. The higher average ratings in Durham and East St. Louis, as well as the higher average ratings produced by female subjects, probably also reflected the advantageousness of NYC work relative to various employment environments. In Durham, for example, rates of pay for non-NYC work were lower than in other sites; in East St. Louis, rates of unemployment were higher than in other sites; and unemployment was generally higher among young women than among young men. These characteristics of employment environments would tend to increase appreciation for NYC work as a form of employment.

TABLE 5.19

MEAN-LIKE-NYC WORK RATINGS[a], PROSPECTIVE STUDY I,
SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(31)	3.8	(77)	4.2
Durham	(13)	4.8	(62)	4.5
East St. Louis	(20)	4.5	(39)	4.5
St. Louis	(22)	4.0	(72)	4.1
All Sites	(86)	4.1	(250)	4.4

[a] Mean of rating on 5-point scale running from "Not at all" (1) to "Very much" (5).

Importance of NYC Work

Enrollee-subjects in Prospective Study II produced high average ratings of the importance of their NYC work (see Table 5.20), with female subjects averaging higher (4.4) than male subjects (4.1). The apparent tendency of female subjects to rate the importance of their NYC work higher than male subjects, was not evidenced in the Durham results (both male and female subjects averaging 4.5); and was much more apparent in St. Louis than in Cincinnati. These results suggested that ratings of the importance of NYC work might be reaching areas similar to those reached in ratings of liking for NYC work.

TABLE 5.20

MEAN RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF NYC WORK[a], PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(33)	4.0	(79)	4.3
Durham	(14)	4.5	(65)	4.5
St. Louis	(16)	3.8	(56)	4.4
All Sites	(63)	4.1	(200)	4.4

[a] Means of ratings on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all" (1) to "Very" (5).

As with like-NYC-work ratings, subjects were asked why they had rated the importance of their NYC jobs as they did. Their responses (see Table 5.21) indicated that they thought of "importance" primarily in terms of work performance rather than in terms of value to future career plans. Among the male subjects, 85 percent of the reason responses substantiated that their work was important, and 55 percent of the reason responses substantiated importance by stating that their jobs were useful, necessary, responsible, etc. Among female subjects, also, most reasons (90 percent) substantiated importance; and most frequently, (56 percent), substantiating reasons involved work performance.

Behavior of NYC Supervisors

On a 5-point scale measuring the closeness of supervision, enrollee-subjects rated their NYC supervision, on the average, a little on the close side (see Table 5.22). Average ratings were highest in Cincinnati (3.4 among male subjects, and 3.8 among female subjects); and in Durham, also, male subjects rated their supervision as less close (3.3) than did female subjects (3.6, on the average). In St. Louis, there was no difference between study subjects in this respect, both male and female subjects rating the closeness of their supervision at 3.3, on the average.

On a 5-point scale measuring the helpfulness of work supervisors (see Table 5.23) there was little difference between male and female subjects, or between study sites. On the average, male subjects rated supervisor helpfulness at 4.1 and female subjects rated supervisor helpfulness at 4.2. Site averages were substantially similar, with the lowest male subject average occurring in St. Louis (3.8) and the highest female subject average occurring in Cincinnati (4.4).

TABLE 5.21

REASONS FOR IMPORTANCE-OF-NYC-WORK RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX

Reasons	Male N=64	Female N=205
	Percent	
Unimportant		
Career--"not important to me," "this training would not take me very far."	2%	4%
The work itself--"Janitor work not important" "Anyone can clean floors," "Was not needed."	13	5
Status--"Just like a maid."	0	1
Important		
Career--"Learned a lot," "Taught me how to work," "This kind of work will never go out of existence."	17%	26%
The work itself--"Anything not cleaning floors is important," "Keeping records straight," "Able to help."	55	56
Status--"Felt like a useful person," "Confidential work," "Dealing with city."	12	7
Reiteration--"an important job."	2	3
TOTAL	101%	102%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(7)

TABLE 5.22

MEAN RATINGS OF CLOSENESS OF SUPERVISION[a], PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(33)	3.4	(78)	3.8
Durham	(14)	3.3	(66)	3.6
St. Louis	(16)	3.3	(56)	3.3
All Sites	(63)	3.3	(200)	3.6

[a] Rated on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all supervised" (1) to "Very closely supervised" (5).

TABLE 5.23

MEAN RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF SUPERVISOR[a], PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Cincinnati	(33)	4.2	(79)	4.4
Durham	(14)	4.1	(64)	4.1
St. Louis	(15)	3.8	(57)	4.1
All Sites	(62)	4.1	(200)	4.2

[a] Rated on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all helpful" (1) to "Very helpful"(5).

Study subjects were asked to give examples of supervisor behavior that would illustrate helpfulness or unhelpfulness, as the case might be (see Table 5.24). Most of the examples were associated with supervisor helpfulness, and the kind of supervisor behavior most often cited as helpful was explicit help in getting work done right--being on the job, setting standards, teaching and helping. Looser supervision was infrequently cited as helpful, and was instanced as unhelpful by about 7 percent of the subjects. Relatively few of the examples of supervisor helpfulness involved activities off the job. These responses thus sketched a picture of businesslike interest in the performance of NYC work, with supervisor helpfulness occurring when supervisors furthered that interest.

Friendliness of Fellow-Workers

Subjects were asked to rate the friendliness of fellow-workers on NYC jobs. These ratings were the highest and most homogeneous of all (see Table 5.25). Regardless of site or the sex of the subject, enrollees tended to indicate that their fellow-workers could not have been more friendly. While "fellow-workers" was not specifically restricted to non-NYC enrollees, these results give little support to the opinion, sometimes expressed, that enrollees were not well-received by the regular employees in their worksites.

TABLE 5.24

EXAMPLES OF UNHELPFUL OR HELPFUL SUPERVISOR BEHAVIOR, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SEX

Examples	Male N=64	Female N=205
	Percent	
Unhelpful		
Performance--"Didn't show me how to do job," "Didn't do her part," "Tell you what to do, but not show you."	3%	2%
Too tight	0	1
Too loose--"Too busy with other things," "Didn't take enough time with workers," "Never around when needed."	8	7
Personal--"Mean," "Always nagging," "Did not like Negroes," "a bastard."	6	2
Reiteration--"As helpful as a dead rat."	2	3
Helpful		
Performance--"Gave help in doing job right," "Would explain things," "Told us what was right and wrong."	56%	53%
Tight--"Stood around to see that work was done," "Always there to correct mistakes."	8	8
Loose--"Told us what to do but left us on our own."	3	3
Personal--"Easy to get along with," "Could go to them for anything."	3	7
Help outside of work assignment--"drove me home," "Got me a job," "Helped me get an apartment."	3	7
Reiteration--"Very helpful."	6	8
TOTAL	98%	101%
Unknown (number)	(2)	(11)

TABLE 5.25

MEAN RATINGS OF FRIENDLINESS OF FELLOW-WORKERS, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE I AND II, BY SITE AND SEX

Site	R II		P I		P II	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Male Subjects						
Cincinnati	(57)	4.6	(30)	4.2	(33)	4.6
Durham	(25)	4.9	(13)	4.5	(14)	4.6
St. Louis	(14)	4.4	(22)	4.7	(16)	4.3
East St. Louis	(37)	4.8	(20)	4.5		
All Sites	(133)	4.7	(85)	4.4	(63)	4.5
Female Subjects						
Cincinnati	(64)	4.4	(77)	4.4	(79)	4.4
Durham	(63)	4.6	(62)	4.4	(65)	4.5
St. Louis	(88)	4.4	(72)	4.6	(57)	4.3
East St. Louis	(30)	4.7	(31)	4.8		
All Sites	(245)	4.5	(249)	4.5	(201)	4.4

Helpfulness of Counselors

Subjects were asked to rate the helpfulness of their NYC Counselors on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all helpful" (1) to "Very helpful" (5). In the several composite study groups, male and female subjects averaged about the same on this scale (see Table 5.26). More extensive differences were apparent in comparisons of site averages—in Prospective Study I, for example, Cincinnati male subjects averaged lower (3.5) than Cincinnati female subjects (4.1), and East St. Louis male subjects averaged higher (4.4) than East St. Louis female subjects (3.9). These differences were not large enough to be statistically significant, however, and were not apparent in the results of

TABLE 5.26

MEAN RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF COUNSELORS[a], RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	R II		P I		P II	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Male Subjects						
Cincinnati	(56)	3.8	(31)	3.5	(33)	4.0
Durham	(26)	4.2	(13)	4.0	(14)	3.7
St. Louis	(14)	4.6	(22)	4.7	(16)	4.3
East St. Louis	(39)	3.9	(19)	4.4		
All Sites	(135)	4.0	(85)	4.1	(63)	4.0
Female Subjects						
Cincinnati	(62)	3.7	(77)	4.1	(78)	4.0
Durham	(63)	4.3	(62)	4.3	(65)	4.1
St. Louis	(87)	4.3	(72)	4.1	(57)	4.2
East St. Louis	(30)	3.8	(38)	3.9		
All Sites	(242)	4.1	(249)	4.1	(200)	4.1

---

[a] Ratings on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all helpful" (1) to "Very helpful" (5).

other studies. It might be concluded, therefore, that this rating may have tapped an area of more variable response than did other ratings. The small number of subjects often involved in the comparisons, though, cautioned against hard and fast conclusions based on these results.

In describing the ways in which their counselors had been helpful, subjects in Prospective Study II emphasized broad or general counselor action and attributes (see Table 5.27). Even though NYC problems, particularly problems with NYC jobs, was the most common topic of counselor discussions (see Table 5.14), help within the NYC was given as an illustration of counselor helpfulness by relatively few subjects. It might be concluded, therefore, that subjects tended to perceive work discussions more as routine counselor behavior than as supportive or helpful counselor activity.

Usefulness of NYC Experience

After having reviewed a number of aspects of NYC experience in the interview items just discussed, interviewers asked study subjects, "All things considered, how useful was your NYC experience as a whole?" Subjects were asked to rate overall NYC usefulness on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all useful" (1) to "Very useful" (5). They were then handed a card listing a number of ways in which the NYC might have been useful and asked to indicate which ways applied in their experience, and which single way was the most useful.

TABLE 5.27

MEAN RATINGS OF COUNSELOR HELPFULNESS AND REASONS FOR RATINGS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP BY SEX

Counselor helpfulness	Male N=64	Female N=205
Mean Ratings[a]	4.0	4.1
Reasons (unhelpfulness):		
Personal or career problems--"Neither got me a job nor got me a trade," "Only talked about going back to school."	2%	2%
Problems within the NYC--"Didn't stand up for you," "Not do anything about problems on the job."	0	1
Accessibility--"Never could get in touch with her," "Didn't come around often enough," "Too many counselors"	8	5
Personal--"Poor attitude," "Fusses too much," "told lies."	2	2
Reiteration--"Did nothing to help"	10	5
Reasons (helpfulness):		
Personal or career problems--"Encouraged me to learn to type," "Helped get welfare for my children," "Helped me get a meaning in life," "Gave me confidence."	37%	32%
Problems within the NYC--"Helped me transfer to another job," "Help with problems with fellow-workers."	11	7
Accessibility--"Always there in the ward," "Could go to her for all kinds of help"	8	12
Personal--"Nice," "Took an interest in me"	14	14
Reiteration--"Helpful with my problems"	10	20
TOTAL	102%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(11)

---

[a] Ratings on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all helpful" (1) to "Very helpful" (5).

Average ratings in the second-round interviews of the Prospective Study were 4.2, or above, in each site--regardless of the sex of the subject (see Table 5.23). Compared to earlier results (second-round interviews in the Retrospective Study and first-round interviews in the Prospective Study), Prospective II results suggested a slight tendency towards higher ratings of overall usefulness among male subjects in Cincinnati and St. Louis.

TABLE 5.28

MEAN RATINGS OF OVERALL USEFULNESS[a] OF NYC EXPERIENCE, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE I AND II SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	R II		P I		P II	
	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean	(N)	Mean
Male Subjects						
Cincinnati	(56)	4.0	(30)	3.9	(33)	4.2
Durham	(26)	4.2	(13)	4.7	(14)	4.4
St. Louis	(14)	3.6	(22)	3.6	(16)	4.4
East St. Louis	(39)	4.1	(18)	4.3		
All Sites	(135)	4.1	(83)	4.3	(63)	4.3
Female Subjects						
Cincinnati	(65)	4.5	(82)	4.4	(82)	4.3
Durham	(63)	4.7	(60)	4.4	(68)	4.4
St. Louis	(87)	4.5	(70)	4.6	(57)	4.4
East St. Louis	(29)	4.3	(39)	4.4		
All Sites	(244)	4.5	(251)	4.5	(207)	4.4

[a] Ratings on a 5-point scale running from "Not at all useful" (1) to "Very useful" (5).

Male subjects in the Prospective II results reported that their NYC experience had been useful in 4.9 ways, on the average, while female subjects reported 4.4 ways on the average (see Table 5.29). Almost every subject reported that the NYC job was in itself "useful" as an interesting job or as a source of income. Among male subjects, the educational component of NYC experience was least likely to be reported as useful; and, among female subjects, help from the work supervisor was least likely to be reported as useful.

TABLE 5.29

ALL WAYS IN WHICH NYC EXPERIENCE WAS USEFUL AND MOST USEFUL ASPECT OF NYC EXPERIENCE PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Ways	Male All Ways	Male Most Useful	Female All Ways	Female Most Useful
	N=64		N=212	
	Percent		Percent	
Help in getting a job after NYC	28%	6%	36%	13%
Help from work supervisor	38	2	24	1
Help from counselor	45	6	32	2
Learning to get along better with people	61	16	53	12
Learning to work for a boss	58	6	38	4
Learning good work habits	64	19	65	19
Getting job skills	53	11	59	21
Continuing education	25	2	32	8
Earning money, having an interesting job	108	26	97	19
Nothing useful	5	5	1	1
TOTAL[a]	485%	99%	437%	100%
Unknown (number)	(2)		(5)	

[a] Total of "All Ways" more than 100 percent because of multiple responses.

When asked to indicate the single most useful aspect of NYC experience, male subjects most frequently (26 percent) reported employment aspects--the NYC income and/or the interest of the NYC work. Female subjects were somewhat less apt (19 percent) to identify NYC employment as such as the most "useful" part of their NYC experience. Both male and female subjects reported general preparations for the world of work--learning to work for a boss, getting good work habits, and continuing education--as most useful to about the same extent (27 percent and 31 percent, respectively). Compared to male subjects, however, female subjects were significantly more apt to report getting job skills and getting post-NYC employment as most useful. Specific vocational usefulness connoted by these two aspects of NYC experience was reported by 34 percent of the female subjects as compared with only 17 percent of the male subjects.

Compared to first-round interviewing results in the Prospective study (see Table 5.30), second-round interviewing results often indicated a decline in the frequency with which subjects reported NYC preparations for the world of work as "most useful" aspects of their NYC experience, and a corresponding increase in the frequency with which general and employment aspects of the experience were considered as "most useful." Among male subjects in St. Louis, for example, second-round interviewing showed NYC vocational preparation down 16 percentage points, with general NYC help up 10 percentage points and NYC as employment up 8 percentage points. Changes of this kind suggested that subjects' perceptions of the usefulness of NYC experience were modified by time, with the vocational value of the experience tending to decline as the extent of post-NYC experience increased.

TABLE 5.30

MOST USEFUL ASPECT OF NYC EXPERIENCE, PROSPECTIVE STUDY I AND II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	PR I	PR II	PR I	PR II
Cincinnati (number reporting)	(27)	(33)	(77)	(83)
Help in getting a job after NYC	4%	6%	12%	19%
Help from supervisor, counselor, learning to get along better with people	33	24	18	12
Learning to work for a boss, getting good work habits, job skills, education	48	39	57	52
Earning money, having an interesting job	11	21	12	16
Nothing	4	9	1	1
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%	100%
Durham (number reporting)	(13)	(14)	(61)	(68)
Help in getting a job after NYC	8%	0%	3%	3%
Help from supervisor, counselor, etc.	23	14	20	19
Learning to work, etc.	54	50	59	57
Earning money, having an interesting job	15	36	18	21
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
St. Louis (number reporting)	(21)	(15)	(69)	(56)
Help in getting a job after NYC	14%	13%	7%	14%
Help from supervisor, counselor, etc.	23	33	13	14
Learning to work, etc.	43	27	58	46
Earning money, having an interesting job	19	27	22	23
Nothing	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	99%
East St. Louis (number reporting)	(20)		(38)	
Help in getting a job after NYC	35%		11%	
Help from supervisor, counselor, etc.	10		16	
Learning to work, etc.	25		47	
Earning money, having an interesting job	30		26	
TOTAL	100%		100%	

Compared to female subjects, the retrospective usefulness of the NYC as a form of employment was greater among male subjects. In each of the three sites that figured in the two interviewing rounds of the Prospective Study, the frequency with which NYC employment was named as a most useful aspect of NYC experience increased more among male subjects. In the composite, 3-site group, the increase amounted to 11 percentage points (from 15 percent in Prospective I to 26 percent in Prospective II). Among female subjects, on the other hand, the increase amounted to 3 percentage points. These results suggested that post-NYC experience among male subjects tended to produce revisions in their estimates of the utility of the NYC experience with the experience becoming more useful as employment rather than as preparation for employment.

In each of the three sites in Prospective II results, the percentages of female subjects who reported most useful NYC aspects that were fairly specific to the world of work (getting post-NYC employment, or learning to work for a boss, getting good work habits, gaining job skills, or continuing education) were greater than the comparable percentages for male subjects. Although retrospective revision was less apparent among female subjects (possibly because they had comparatively less post-NYC experience and comparatively less post-NYC employment), these results suggested that female subjects tended to perceive more vocational utility in their NYC experience.

One site, East St. Louis, did not figure in Prospective II results. It was of interest that, in this site, Prospective I results indicated fairly distinct enrollee perceptions of NYC utility. Compared to Prospective I results in the other sites, very significantly more of the male subjects in East St. Louis reported that the most useful aspect of their NYC experience had been help in getting post-NYC employment. The percentage of male subjects in East St. Louis that reported the most useful aspect of their NYC experience to have been its employment aspect, furthermore, was considerably higher than comparable percentages in other sites. The work-training aspects of NYC experience, as well as the general helpfulness of personnel and general counseling aspects, were correspondingly less frequently mentioned by male subjects in East St. Louis. While female subjects in East St. Louis also reported the employment aspects of the NYC as most useful more frequently than did female subjects in other sites, their pattern of response was not as distinct as that of male subjects in East St. Louis. In East St. Louis, then, the utility of the NYC as preparation for the world of work was less often perceived by enrollees; and--particularly among male enrollees--the program was perceived as useful primarily as a job or as a way to a job.

Post-NYC Jobs in Worksite Agencies

Some NYC worksites--for example, hospital worksites--could offer post-NYC employment to NYC enrollees. In such sites, NYC work-training could be very directly related to post-NYC employment, with NYC experience preparing the enrollee for a specific place in the world of work. This employment potential could be expected to be reflected in enrollees' views of the usefulness of their NYC experience.

Identical percentage of males and females (11 percent) obtained jobs through their worksite with Cincinnati and Durham worksites offering more employment opportunities than the other two sites (see Table 5.31).

TABLE 5.31

POST-NYC JOB IN WORKSITE AGENCY, PROSPECTIVE II SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male		Female	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Cincinnati	(33)	6%	(78)	18%
Durham	(14)	21%	(61)	15%
St. Louis	(15)	13%	(51)	4%
East St. Louis[a]	(18)	11%	(35)	0%
TOTAL	(80)	11%	(225)	11%

[a] Prospective I results in East St. Louis.

NYC Help with Post-NYC Employment

Subjects were asked whether the NYC had helped them to get employment in any of a number of ways listed on a card. The options provided included "no help" and about one subject in seven indicated that the NYC had not helped him to find post-NYC work (see Table 5.32). Around 60 percent of the subjects, however, indicated that the NYC had provided some help to them with approximately the same proportions of male and female subjects in both the Prospective and Retrospective studies reporting one or more ways in which the NYC had helped them with respect to post-NYC employment

TABLE 5.32

NYC HELP IN GETTING POST-NYC EMPLOYMENT, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II STUDIES, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

NYC help	Male		Female	
	R II N=99	P II N=64	R II N=217	P II N=205
	Percent		Percent	
NYC help reported	59%	64%	65%	63%
"It was of no help"	39	28	22	27
No report--still in the NYC	2	0	12	5
Unknown	0	8	1	5
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

Compared to Retrospective II results, Prospective II results indicated that the extent of post-NYC employment help increased as the programs developed (see Table 5.33). Among male subjects, 1.7 ways were reported, on the average, in the Retrospective Study while 2.4 ways were reported in the Prospective Study; and, among female subjects, the comparable averages were 1.6 and 2.5 ways. The increased scope of NYC help in this respect occurred primarily in areas of job-getting techniques--how to look for jobs, how to fill out application forms, and how to take job tests. Among female subjects, the proportion of subjects reporting the specific NYC placement help of making an appointment with a prospective employer on behalf of the enrollee increased very significantly (from 41 percent to 64 percent) in the Prospective II results. Among male subjects, though, the proportion of subjects reporting this kind of NYC help was about the same in both studies (53 percent, and 54 percent, respectively).

TABLE 5.33

WAYS IN WHICH NYC HELPED IN GETTING POST-NYC EMPLOYMENT, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II STUDIES, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP BY SEX

Ways in which NYC helped	Male		Female	
	R II N=99	P II N=64	R II N=217	P II N=205
Made an appointment for me with employer	53%	54%	41%	64%
Told me where I might find a job	52	61	39	38
Told me how to look for a job	28	41	25	46
Helped me fill out application forms	17	34	28	50
Gave me practice in taking job tests	21	49	27	49
TOTAL[a]	168%	239%	160%	247%
No help reported (number)[b]	(41)	(23)	(77)	(65)

[a] Subjects could report more than one way.

[b] Included reports of no help, active enrollees, and unknowns.

Of the subjects who reported some kind of NYC help with post-NYC employment, the proportion reporting employer appointments was highest in the Prospective II results among female subjects in Cincinnati (see Table 5.34). Although Prospective II results were not available for East St. Louis, comparisons of other results from this site indicated that it was significantly less apt to have provided this kind of post-NYC employment help than were the other sites.

TABLE 5.34

APPOINTMENTS WITH POST-NYC EMPLOYER, RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE STUDIES, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male				Female			
	R II		P II		R II		P II	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Cincinnati	(35)	57%	(21)	52%	(51)	41%	(60)	70%
Durham	(16)	50	(8)	50	(29)	52	(32)	56
St. Louis	(7)	43	(12)	58	(60)	37	(37)	43
East St. Louis[a]	(34)	6	(14)	7	(19)	16	(22)	23

[a] Prospective I results in East St. Louis.

Some general NYC help with respect to post-NYC employment--for example, how to look for a job--might be delivered routinely in counseling sessions. Specific NYC help relating the enrollee to particular employment--for example, arranging an appointment with a prospective employer, however, would normally occur at the end of an NYC enrollment when the enrollee was ready for a job. Enrollees who separated from the NYC before they were ready for a job might thus miss out on some NYC help with post-NYC employment. Many of the enrollee-subjects who reported no NYC help with post-NYC employment had probably left the program prematurely. Although follow-up interviews did not investigate the nature of the subject's separation from the NYC, it could be speculated that the generally greater employability needs of male subjects, together with their generally shorter NYC enrollments, connoted more premature terminations among male enrollees. If so, the fact that approximately the same proportion of male, as of female, subjects reported

NYC employment help; and the fact that at least half of the male subjects so reporting had been helped via an NYC employer appointment, indicated that the NYC might have functioned as a referral agency as much as a training program for some male enrollees.

Liked and Disliked Aspects of NYC Experience

Subjects were asked two questions: "What did you like best about your NYC experience?" and "What did you dislike about your NYC experience?" Both of these questions presumed response--that is, subjects could describe liked and disliked aspects of their NYC experience even though they might have liked the program, in general, very little or very much--and both questions called for volunteered, or unstructured, descriptions of program experience. Responses to these questions were organized on the basis of specific mentions of various aspects of NYC experience (see Tables 5.35 and 5.36).

Most of the responses pertained to NYC work, working conditions, and social aspects of the NYC experience. "Liked" responses in this category included descriptions of work performed while in the NYC, mentions of the pay or income aspect of the NYC, and appreciations of the short work-week, the work supervisor, and co-workers. "Disliked" responses in this category, similarly, reflected descriptions of the kind of work done, dissatisfactions with the pay, hours, or working conditions, or displeasure related to associations with supervisors or co-workers. The expectation of responses to both questions permitted a subject to identify both liked and disliked aspects of work experience--for example, like the work but the pay was not enough, or pay was O.K., considering the hours, but had to wait too long for paychecks.

TABLE 5.35

BEST-LIKED ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX

Aspects	Male		Female	
	R II N=99	P II N=64	R II N=217	P II N=212
	Percent		Percent	
NYC work, working conditions, associations	54%	42%	58%	53%
Education	2	5	4	4
Counseling	5	3	4	3
Career	25	41	27	35
General or comprehensive liking	6	5	5	4
Didn't like the NYC	6	5	3	2
TOTAL	99%	101%	101%	101%
Unknown (number)	(6)	(1)	(4)	(6)

TABLE 5.36

DISLIKED ASPECTS OF NYC EXPERIENCE, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN 3-SITE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP, BY SEX

Aspects	Male		Female	
	R II N=99	P II N=64	R II N=217	P II N=212
	Percent		Percent	
NYC work, working conditions, associations	51%	43%	50%	54%
Education	0	0	2	0
Counseling	2	4	6	4
Career	2	2	7	2
General or comprehensive dislike	0	4	2	4
Disliked nothing in the NYC	45	40	41	36
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(3)	(1)	(5)	(5)

Specific mentions of the educational and counseling components of NYC experience were separately categorized as were responses describing the "Career" aspects of NYC experience--the opportunity it provided for personal improvement and/or its vocational value in terms of post-NYC employment. Unspecific, general, or comprehensive responses comprised a separate category.

The two major categories of best-liked aspects of NYC experience were NYC work and the career potential of NYC work-training (see Table 5.35). Compared to Retrospective II results, Prospective II interviews more often reported appreciations of the career or opportunity aspect of NYC experience. This difference between Retrospective and Prospective study results was particularly clear among male subjects in that, in the Retrospective results, about twice as many male subjects reported liking best their NYC work as reported liking best the preparational aspect of the experience while, in the Prospective results, these two response categories were reported with equal frequency. Very few subjects were unable to name a liked aspect of their NYC experience.

Approximately two out of five subjects could not describe a disliked aspect of their NYC experience (see Table 5.36) and responded, instead, that there was nothing they disliked about the NYC. Almost all of the other responses here described aspects of NYC work. In view of the circumstances of this question (that is, subjects were expected to describe disliked aspects), and in view of the inability of many subjects to identify any dislike aspects, it seems likely that the intensity of dislike was often minimal.

In both the Retrospective II and Prospective II results, male subjects in Durham more frequently reported that they disliked nothing about the NYC than did male subjects in other sites (see Table 5.37). When the two groups are combined differences become significant.

Retrospective II results showed that female subjects in the two smaller sites were very significantly more apt to report that they disliked nothing about the NYC than were female subjects in the two metropolitan sites. In the Prospective results, the proportion of strong acceptance by female subjects in Durham and East St. Louis was somewhat smaller than in the Retrospective results, but still very significantly larger than the comparable proportion among female subjects in Cincinnati and St. Louis.[1]

These results were similar to those produced by questions concerning liking for NYC work (see supra p 215), and thus tended to emphasize the impression that the acceptance of the NYC was strongest in the smaller sites.

Appreciations of the NYC as an opportunity for self-development and for preparations for the world of work (like aspects of "Education" and "Career"), were more frequently reported in the Prospective than in the Retrospective Study (see Table 5.35). Compared to female subjects, male subjects in the Retrospective Study were less apt to mention these opportunities as best-liked aspects of NYC experience; while, in the Prospective study, male subjects were a little more apt to describe these aspects. These results indicated that, as the programs developed, the preparational character of NYC experience was coming through more clearly to the enrollees--particularly for the male enrollees.

---

[1] Prospective I results for East St. Louis used in this comparison. At the time of Prospective I interviewing, 7 of the female subjects in East St. Louis (22 percent) were still in the NYC. Their responses were thus not entirely comparable. At the same time, the primary context of response to this question was NYC experience rather than post-NYC evaluations and the active enrollee status of these subjects would not disqualify them.

TABLE 5.37

NOTHING DISLIKED ABOUT THE NYC, RETROSPECTIVE II AND PROSPECTIVE II, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS BY SITE AND SEX

Site	Male				Female			
	R II		P II		R II		P II	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Cincinnati	(56)	41%	(33)	36%	(64)	30%	(80)	32%
Durham	(26)	58	(13)	64	(62)	63	(66)	47
St. Louis	(14)	36	(16)	25	(86)	33	(56)	28
East St. Louis[a]	(37)	43	(19)	37	(26)	62	(38)	47

[a] Prospective I in East St. Louis.

The NYC Image

Study subjects were asked two questions about their general impressions of the NYC: "What is there about the NYC that might make a person want to get in it?" and "What is there about the NYC that might make a person not want to get in it?" The responses, however, provided an image of the program that might also be available to potential enrollees asking similar questions of their friends.

Male subjects in the Experimental group gave about equal weight to two categories of attractive NYC features, 48 percent describing the opportunities provided by the NYC for self-improvement, and 48 percent describing the attraction of the NYC experience itself (see Table 5.38). Compared to these subjects, female subjects were significantly more apt to report opportunities as attractive NYC features (77 percent, and 64 percent, respectively). The NYC as a means of employability enhancement, in other words, was not coming through as clearly for male as for female enrollees.

TABLE 5.38

WHAT IS THERE ABOUT THE NYC THAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON WANT TO GET IN IT? EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX

Attractive NYC features	Male N=64	Female N=205
	Percent	
Self-development help		
Career help, vocational value of training	29%	46%
Self-improvement, educational opportunity	14	9
Earn and learn	5	9
NYC experience itself		
Kind of work, pay, hours	40	29
NYC personnel helpful, kind	8	7
Nothing	5	1
TOTAL	101%	101%
Unknown and Not Applicable (number)	(1)	(7)

NYC work-experience was considered attractive because of the kind of work done (interesting job, easy job, chance to help others) or because it was a good job under the circumstances. Some respondents, for example, noted that "considering the hours, it's a good job," or "jobs are OK for younger persons," or "better than nothing." A little less than one-tenth of the respondents reported that NYC personnel constituted an attractive feature of the program.

The other side of the coin, NYC features that might repel potential enrollees, stressed the bread-and-butter issues of NYC experience--short work weeks, short pay, bi-weekly paychecks, lack of leave, and the like, (see Table 5.39). About 10 percent of the respondents, noted other drawbacks--"nasty bosses," testing procedures, difficulty of getting into the program, and the poor image of the program. Apart from the drawbacks of the NYC as a way of earning money, however, the most frequent response of study subjects to the question of "What might make a person not want to get in the NYC?" was "Nothing". A few subjects, also, noted that the characteristics of a potential enrollee (not "anxious to make something of himself," or "rocks in his head") might keep a person from trying to get in the NYC. From 40 to 50 percent of the respondents, depending on the study sub-group, either answered "nothing" or stressed individual rather than program characteristics as drawbacks. The well-motivated potential enrollee inquiring about program drawbacks, therefore, might have a 50-50 chance of hearing nothing adverse concerning the NYC.

If the source of the potential enrollees' NYC information were a male enrollee or ex-enrollee, he would probably get a definite impression of the NYC as a form of employment that might, under certain circumstances, be an acceptable activity. The NYC as a means of improving one's preparations for the world of work would come through less frequently and less clearly. If, on the other hand, the source of the potential enrollee's information were a female enrollee or ex-enrollee, he might get an impression of the program that emphasized the drawbacks of the program as a form of employment but also stressed its potential to enhance employability.

TABLE 5.39

WHAT IS THERE ABOUT THE NYC THAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON NOT WANT TO GET IN IT? EXPERIMENTAL SUBJECTS PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX

NYC Drawbacks	Male N=64	Female N=205
	Percent	
Not vocationally useful	3%	4%
NYC experience		
Kind of work, pay, hours, location	46	47
NYC personnel, including enrollees, policies	9	10
The person himself (lack of ambition, etc.)	5	7
Nothing	38	32
TOTAL	101%	100%
Unknown and Not Applicable (number)	(3)	(14)

Summary

Study results reported in this chapter have been viewed in the light of three comparisons: Prospective Study results have been compared with Retrospective Study results with the expectation that Prospective results, reflecting programs in a later phase of development, might show change; site results have been compared with the expectation that the several sites might develop programs with varying emphases; and, finally, results have been compared on the basis of sex, with the expectation that the perceptions of program experience of male enrollees might differ from those of female enrollees.

Compared to Retrospective II results, enrollee perceptions of the NYC in Prospective II indicated that the quality of NYC experience improved as the programs gained experience. This was particularly evident with male subjects who, in the Prospective Study, reported more work assignments involving skills, more participation in special NYC classes and/or courses, more frequent meetings with counselors, and more appreciation of the NYC as an opportunity for self-development and advancement. Compared to male subjects, female subjects in the Retrospective Study were more apt to report these as aspects of NYC experience, Prospective Study results showed smaller increases; and, as a result, the quality of NYC experience in the Prospective results was more nearly uniform for male and female enrollees.

Even though participation in special NYC classes and courses was greater in the Prospective Study, the great majority of subjects--78 percent of the males and 63 percent of the females--reported no such participation, and very few of the subjects--2 percent of the males and 8 percent of the females--considered it a most useful aspect of their NYC experience. These results indicated that the remedial and supplementary educational needs of enrollees, which were particularly extensive among males, were not being met by the programs reflected in the study.

The increased frequency of counselor meetings in the Prospective Study and the increased emphasis on counseling associated with NYC assignments was, perhaps, reflected in the increased appreciation of the program as an opportunity to prepare for the world of work. Since the counseling function was often discharged in connection with other NYC program components, enrollee perceptions of the utility of counseling, as such, might tend to be limited. In any case, in the perceptions of enrollees, counseling--like education--was a relatively minor part of NYC experience.

The overall program objective of enhanced enrollee employability was most directly achieved when enrollees found post-NYC jobs in NYC agency worksites. This source of potential program effectiveness was indicated, to varying extents, by the subjects in the several study subgroups. The variations between comparative results--study, site, and sex comparisons--suggested that working into post-NYC agency employment via NYC work assignments was not a regular part of NYC experience--except, possibly, in Cincinnati where 19 percent of the female subjects in the Retrospective study and 18 percent in the Prospective study reported such employment.

About half of the subjects in both the Retrospective and Prospective studies reported that the NYC had made appointments for them with prospective post-NYC employers.

About three-fifths of the subjects in both Retrospective and Prospective studies reported that the NYC had provided some help in connection with getting post-NYC jobs, and about half of these subjects reported very specific help in that the NYC had set up employer appointments for them. One site, East St. Louis, provided very much less specific help in this respect than did the other sites. Although some of the instances in which post-NYC employment help was not forthcoming undoubtedly reflected premature separations from the program, failures of the NYC programs to follow through with placement help undoubtedly contributed to employment ineffectiveness.

Site differences, discussed in some detail in this chapter, did not lend themselves to summarization. They suggested, rather, that NYC participation, as experienced by enrollees in the several sites, was by no means uniform.

VI

Non-Vocational Characteristics of Study Subjects
Interview Information

In this and in the following chapter, information secured through follow-up interviews of study subjects, conducted in the summer and fall of 1969, is reported. For subjects in the Experimental group, the information reported in these two chapters reflected activities and situations subsequent to NYC enrollment; while, for subjects in the Control group, the information reflected a chronologically comparable period of time. Comparisons between subjects in the two study groups thus permitted judgments concerning the extent to which program goals were being realized in the experience of enrollee-subjects.

The goal of the NYC is to help enrollees to become productive members of society. In this study, operational definitions of productive citizenship included getting and keeping a job, achieving self-support, and staying on the right side of the law, and activities compatible with productive citizenship such as educational and vocational preparation for the world of work and discharging military service obligations. The study hypothesized that the NYC programs had helped enrollees in these terms. Employment outcomes of NYC experience are reported in the following chapter, while this chapter reports results in non-vocational areas.

The non-vocational characteristics of interviewed study subjects not only provided some bases for judging program effect, but also provided contexts for the consideration of vocational outcomes reported in Chapter VII. Thus, the extent of academic and vocational preparation after dropping out of (or leaving) school or to take another example--the extent to which male subjects were heads of family, might have a bearing on employment outcomes. In a sense, then, the non-vocational characteristics of study subjects were matching variables as well as descriptive variables in their own right.

Ideally, in studies utilizing an Experimental-Control design, the Control study group is the same as the Experimental study group except for the treatment variable -- in the present study, NYC experience. If this ideal could be realized, all outcome differences -- in this study differences in adjustment to adult life and the world of work-- might reasonably be attributed to NYC experience. In reality, it is very difficult to achieve this match since it is seldom possible to assign subjects randomly to the Experimental and Control groups. Without such random assignments, there is always the possibility of motivational differences between the two groups resulting in participation on the part of one group and non-participation on the part of the other. In the present study, it was possible in one site (St. Louis) to make random assignments, but even here it proved impossible to keep members of the Control group from enrolling in the NYC at a later time.

Based on interview data, Experimental and Control groups were found to match on the variable of school grade completed, sex, and race; but, differed in age in that the male Control subjects were significantly older. (See Table 6.1) The difference probably resulted from a greater tendency of the younger male Control subjects to enroll in the NYC programs. There was also a greater tendency for the Control subjects to return to full-time school and to be married at time of interview.

Each of these measures (age, returning to school, and marriage) are measures of maturity and indicate that, at the time of interview, the Control group, particularly the males, were more mature than the Experimental group and that the efforts to match the two groups had not been completely successful. An alternate explanation is that the NYC program had a negative effect with respect to the variables of return to school and marriage but this seems unlikely.

The above results emphasize the difficulties in selecting Control groups and the cautions which should be observed when interpreting the results.

TABLE 6.1

YEAR OF BIRTH, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II,
INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Year of Birth	Male		Female	
	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=212	Con. N=142
	Percent		Percent	
Born 1946, or earlier	5%	14%	14%	26%
1947	9	20	18	14
1948	20	25	25	20
1949	31	23	25	19
1950, or later	35	17	18	22
TOTAL	100%	99%	100%	101%
Mean Year of Birth	48.8	48.0	48.1	47.9

Return to Full-Time School

After they first left school--either through dropout or through graduation from high school--most of the study subjects did not return to full-time school (see Table 6.2). Among the male subjects who returned to full-time school--13 percent of those in the Experimental group and 16 percent of those in the Control group--formal academic progress was slight. Three-fourths of the male returnees in the Experimental group stayed in school six months or less, and only one of them graduated from high school. Male returnees in the Control group made somewhat better progress, averaging nearly 12 months in school, with four of them (six percent of all subjects in this study group) completing high school.

Compared to male subjects, female subjects were more apt to return to school after dropping out and they were more apt to complete high school when they did return. Among all of the study subgroups, male subjects in the Experimental group had the least successful experiences, and female subjects in the Control group had the most successful experiences, with resumed full-time schooling. Return to full-time school brought the portion of high school graduates in the male Experimental group to 11 percent (see Table 6.3). This was the lowest percentage of high school graduation, comparing with 20 percent (male Control), 25 percent (female Experimental), and 28 percent (female Control).

TABLE 6.2

FULL-TIME SCHOOLING AFTER HIGH SCHOOL OR DROPOUT, SELECTED VARIABLES PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Variables	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=205	Con. N=138
Never returned to full-time school	88%	84%	78%	68%
Returned to full-time school:	2%	6%	7%	12%
Completed high school or more				
Did not complete high school	11	10	14	20
TOTAL	101%	100%	99%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)
Returned to full-time school:	(N=8)	(N=11)	(N=44)	(N=44)
Mean months in school	4.5	11.6	8.00	11.2
In school 6 months, or less	76%	45%	54%	30%
Months unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)

TABLE 6.3

PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION[a] AND SCHOOL DROPOUT

Graduation and Dropout	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	 Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
Graduated:				
Did not dropout	9%	14%	18%	16%
Dropped out and returned to school	2	6	7	12
Never graduated from high school	88%	80%	75%	72%
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)

[a] Includes subjects reporting education additional to high school.

Academic Courses Outside of Full-Time School

Approximately one-third of the subjects in Experimental study groups tried to improve their academic preparation for adult life by enrolling in academic courses outside of regular full-time school (see Table 6.4). This proportion was larger than comparable proportions in the Control study groups--very significantly larger in the case of male subjects--and suggested that one of the effects of NYC experience was increased involvement in remedial education.

The extent of involvement in remedial education courses was reported in hours of class time. Among subjects who enrolled in academic courses outside of full-time school, male subjects in the Experimental group averaged the fewest class hours (141), and female subjects in the Experimental group averaged the most (254). If one academic unit in regular full-time school--a year's work in English, for example--represented in the neighborhood of 160 class hours, male subjects advanced their academic preparations no more than one academic unit, on the average, through courses outside of full-time school; and female subjects advanced no more than two academic units, on the average.

The range of class hours in outside academic courses was considerable, with a few subjects reporting more than a thousand hours. Most subjects who enrolled in such courses, however, reported 200 hours, or less.

TABLE 6.4

ACADEMIC COURSES OUTSIDE OF FULL-TIME SCHOOL, SELECTED VARIABLES PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Variables	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=205	Con. N=138
No academic courses outside of school	67%	87%	66%	74%
Enrolled in outside academic courses	33	13	34	26
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(3)	(1)
Enrolled in outside academic courses:	(N=21)	(N=9)	(N=68)	(N=36)
Mean hours of class time in courses	141	180	254	205
200 hours, or less (percent)	80%	63%	72%	30%
Hours unknown (number)	(1)	(1)	(3)	(0)

Vocational Courses Outside of Full-Time School

Most of the study subjects reported no vocational courses outside of full-time school (see Table 6.5). No more than 24 percent of the subjects in any study subgroup--the lowest was 14 percent in the male Control and the highest was 24 percent in the female Control--reported such efforts to improve their preparations for the world of work. As with part-time academic courses, the extent of vocational course work was reported in class hours; and, again, the range of reported involvement was considerable. Half, or more, of the subjects in each study subgroup who reported time in vocational courses, however, spent 200 hours, or less, in such courses. This amount of time might represent a 10-week, 20-hour-a-week, training course or a more extended training period involving evening classes. Comparatively substantial vocational training (more than 200 hours) thus involved very few subjects: among the males, four in the Experimental group and three in the Control, and among the females, 21 in the Experimental group and 14 in the Control.

Most frequently, male subjects reported that their vocational courses were in the semi-professional, technician, or skilled manual occupational areas--66 percent of those reporting in the Experimental group, and 70 percent of those reporting in the Control group, reported courses in these areas. Among female subjects, the three most frequently reported occupational preparations in the Experimental group were office clerical, data processing, and skilled manual work. Among female subjects in the Control group who reported vocational preparation, the three most frequently reported occupational fields were office clerical, skilled manual, and food service.

The very significantly greater involvement in data processing training of female subjects in the Experimental group might reasonably be associated with their NYC experience.

TABLE 6.5

VOCATIONAL COURSES OUTSIDE OF FULL-TIME SCHOOL, SELECTED VARIABLES
PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Variables	Male		Female	
	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=205	Con. N=138
No vocational courses outside of school	83%	86%	79%	76%
Enrolled in outside vocational courses	17	14	21	24
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(3)	(1)
Enrolled in vocational courses:	(N=10)	(N=10)	(N=43)	(N=33)
Kind of work being trained for:				
Office clerical	11%	20%	51%	55%
Data processing	0	0	28	3
Semi-professional or technician	22	20	5	9
Skilled manual work	44	50	10	21
Machine operator	11	0	0	0
Food service or preparation	11	10	5	12
TOTAL	99%	100%	99%	100%
Kind of work unknown (number)	(1)	(0)	(4)	(0)
Mean hours of class time in courses	785	262	339	296
200 hours, or less (percent)	50%	66%	52%	57%
Hours unknown (number)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(0)

Experience in Federal Manpower Programs Other than the NYC

The experience of study subjects in Federal Manpower Programs other than the NYC was similar in both comparative study groups (see Table 6.6). The extent of this experience was slight: among male subjects, no more than four percent of the subjects in either study group completed any program experience; and, among female subjects, no more than seven percent completed any program experience. Expressed as an average for all subjects in the respective study subgroups, the average months in all manpower programs other than NYC ranged from 1.0 month (female Experimental) to 1.8 months (male Control).

TABLE 6.6

EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS OTHER THAN NYC, PROSPECTIVE II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Program and Experience	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	 Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
Job Corps				
Enrolled	19%	13%	3%	4%
In more than 6 months	8%	5%	-	2%
Completed enrollment	3%	1%	-	1%
MDTA				
Enrolled	8%	6%	11%	12%
In more than 6 months	2%	0	2%	1%
Completed course	2%	3%	7%	7%
OJT				
Enrolled	11%	9%	11%	9%
In more than 6 months	2%	2%	-	2%
Completed training	3%	4%	6%	7%
	Mean		Mean	
Average, all programs (months)[a]	1.5	1.8	1.0	1.3

---

[a] Total months reported, all programs, divided by number in group.

Vocational Preparation After Leaving School

All told, approximately two-fifths of the interviewed subjects in each of the Prospective study subgroups reported enrollment in some vocational course or training program after leaving school (see Table 6.7). Vocational courses not identified as Federal Manpower Programs--courses in business or trade schools, or in the city educational system--were less frequently reported than the major Federal Manpower programs (either alone, or in combination with other vocational courses). Federal Manpower Programs thus substantially augmented the opportunities for enhanced vocational preparation for these young persons.

The generally poor achievement of study subjects enrolling in these courses and programs indicated that the opportunities represented by them were incompletely realized. Part of this poor achievement may have been a function of single enrollment experiences: only one-tenth of the subjects, regardless of study subgroup, enrolled in more than one Federal Manpower Program or combined enrollment in Federal Manpower Programs with other vocational course enrollment. Failure to complete the vocational course in which he had enrolled thus tended to mean failure to enhance vocational preparation. The lack of liaison was particularly marked in the case of Job Corps enrollments reported by male subjects in the Experimental group which were combined with other enrollments by only three percent of the subjects.

Although there were opportunities for study subjects to improve their vocational preparation after they left school, most subjects--approximately three-fifths of each study subgroup--did not avail themselves of these opportunities. Among those subjects that did enroll, this effort to enhance vocational preparation typically involved a single enrollment which, most often, was not completed.

TABLE 6.7

ENROLLMENT IN FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS, OTHER THAN NYC,
AND IN VOCATIONAL COURSES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II,
BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Enrollment	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	 Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
Federal Manpower Programs				
Job Corps only	16%	7%	2%	2%
MDTA	2	3	6	7
OJT	0	4	7	4
Two, or more, FMP	5	7	1	1
Sub-total, FMP only	23%	21%	16%	14%
Other Vocational Courses Only	9%	10%	14%	15%
Other Vocational and FMP	6%	4%	7%	9%
Enrollment	38%	35%	37%	38%
No vocational enrollment	63%	63%	61%	61%
TOTAL	101%	98%	98%	99%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(1)	(3)	(0)

Goals of Academic and Vocational Work Undertaken After Leaving School

All told, from 36 percent to 61 percent, depending on the study subgroup, of the interviewed subjects in the Prospective study undertook academic and/or vocational course work after leaving school (see Table 6.8). Among male subjects, significantly more of those in the Experimental group (53 percent) than those in the Control group (36 percent) undertook such additional preparation for adult life and the world of work. At the same time, significantly more of the male subjects in the Experimental group than those in the Control group seemed to lack commitment to these efforts in the sense that they had no clear-cut goals. Approximately the same portions of male subjects in the two comparative study groups reported goal-associated course work and most of the goals were in academic course work.

Among female subjects, there were virtually no differences between study groups with respect to the extent of additional academic and/or vocational work, or the association of such work with clear-cut course goals.

The most frequently reported goal was the attainment of a High School diploma or the achievement of a High School Equivalency certificate. In the Experimental group, 21 percent of the male subjects and 22 percent of the female subjects reported course work toward this goal; and, in the Control group, the comparable proportions were 14 percent and 21 percent, respectively. As we have seen, study subjects who resolved to further their education either through returning to full-time school after dropout or through part-time academic courses met with indifferent success. In the Experimental group, for example, 21 percent of the male subjects undertook to complete High School, but only two percent returned to full-time school and graduated. None of these subjects completed more than 400 hours of academic classes outside of full-time school and thus none could have made up as much as a grade year in this way. Among female subjects in the Experimental group, academic success was more frequent, but still partial--in this subgroup, 21 percent undertook to finish High School, seven percent succeeded by returning to full-time school, and three percent reported more than 700 hours of part-time academic work--enough to have made up a grade year or more.

TABLE 6.8

GOALS OF ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL WORK UNDERTAKEN AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL[a] PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Goals	Male		Female	
	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=205	Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
No academic or vocational work undertaken	47%	64%	39%	39%
Academic and/or vocational work:				
No goal--"just taking courses"	22%	7%	19%	19%
Goals--diploma or certificate:				
High School Equivalency certificate	5%	4%	1%	1%
High School Diploma	16	10	21	20
Jr. College or College	0	1	1	4
Business School Diploma	0	0	1	1
Vocational training certificate	6	7	7	9
Academic and vocational goals	0	1	1	0
Sub-total, goals	27%	23%	32%	35%
Goals not reported	5%	4%	10%	8%
TOTAL	101%	98%	100%	101%

---

[a] Work undertaken since graduating from high school, or since first dropping out of school before graduating from high school.

NYC Enrollment and Other Opportunities

The several sites in this research provided subjects with various opportunities to prepare for and to participate in the world of work. Each of these "opportunity structures" included the NYC as a means of improving employment prospects; and it has been of interest to investigate whether study subjects who enrolled in the NYC thereby tended to lose out on other preparational opportunities. As we have seen, the principal differences between study subjects with respect to academic and vocational preparations reflected sex rather than study group so that, in general, NYC experience was an additional rather than a substitute opportunity.

In the composite (three-site) study groups, 61 percent of the female subjects in both the Experimental and the Control groups undertook some additional preparation after dropping out of school--returning to full-time school, enrolling in part-time academic courses, or in vocational training (includung Federal Manpower Programs other than the NYC). There were no significant differences between study groups when these results were analyzed by site and race (see Table 6.9). Among male subjects, however, significantly more Negro subjects in the Experimental group than in the Control group reported continuing preparations for the world of work; while, among white subjects, fewer subjects in the Experimental than in the Control group reported such preparation. Although the number of white male subjects was too small to support statistical conclusions, these results suggested that white male subjects in the Experimental group tended to substitute NYC experience for all other preparational experiences.

As has been reported earlier, few of the subjects who enrolled in academic or vocational courses achieved much success as judged by high school completion or the completion of training programs. The fact that disproportionately few white males in the Experimental group enrolled in other preparational courses or programs thus did not connote substantially less achievement in such efforts. Rather, these subjects tended to be uninvolved, while Negro male subjects tended to be minimally involved, in preparations other than those represented by NYC.

TABLE 6.9

PROPORTIONS OF SUBJECTS TAKING COURSES AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX, SITE, RACE, AND STUDY GROUP

	Experimental		Control	
	All Subjects	Taking Courses	All Subjects	Taking Courses
	N	%	N	%
Male, by site				
Cincinnati	33	61%	31	32%
Durham	15	40	23	48
St. Louis	16	50	15	27
TOTAL	64	53%	69	36%
Male, by race				
White	13	15%	20	35%
Negro	51	63%	49	37%
Female, by site				
Cincinnati	80	64%	58	66%
Durham	68	63	40	50
St. Louis	57	56	40	65
TOTAL	205	61%	138	61%
Female, by race				
White	17	41%	18	33%
Negro	188	63%	120	65%

Military Service and Draft Classification

In the period covered by this study, military service and draft status widely affected the activities of young men. Male subjects in the two study groups were substantially similar in this area of experience with one exception: significantly fewer subjects in the Experimental group (8 percent) than in the Control group (22 percent) reported deferred active military obligations due to student status, family responsibilities, or membership in a reserve unit (see Table 6.10). It was of interest that 38 percent of the subjects in each study group had been found to be unfit for service--either partially (1Y) or totally (4F).

TABLE 6.10

MILITARY SERVICE AND DRAFT CLASSIFICATIONS,
PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, MALE SUBJECTS

Service and Classification	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69
	Percent	
Served in Armed Forces:		
Enlisted	19%	14%
Was drafted	0	3
No military service, draft classification:		
1A	19%	13%
1Y	33	28
4F	5	10
Other (deferred status and reserve)	8	22
No military service, no draft classification	13%	7%
No reported service or classification	5	3
TOTAL	102%	100%

Physical Handicaps Observed by Interviewers

So far as the interviewers could observe, the great majority of study subjects had no physical or personal handicaps (see Table 6.11). While the interviewers' impressions were necessarily superficial, they tended to confirm the conclusion that subjects in the comparative study groups were matched so far as obvious disabilities were concerned.

TABLE 6.11

PHYSICAL HANDICAPS OBSERVED BY INTERVIEWERS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II
BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Observed Handicaps	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	Female Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
None	91%	94%	98%	96%
Handicaps observed:				
Size (obesity, dwarfism)	2%	0%	1%	1%
Loss of limb	3	4	0	2
Impaired speech	2	0	0	0
Impaired eyesight	2	0	0	0
Other	2	1	0	2
TOTAL	102%	99%	99%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)

Family Situation at the Time of Interview

The process of becoming an adult ordinarily involves changes in an individual's family situation. As a child, the individual is dependent on a parental family unit; and, as an adult, the individual is a principal member of his own family unit. The process is often gradual, with dependency being reduced before it is erased and with the new, second-generation, family unit forming after a period of unmarried independence. Where an individual is in the process can influence his world-of-work activities. A young man with family responsibilities of his own, for example, might be more anxious for steady employment than a young man, living with his parents, whose principal employment need was to earn spending money.[1] Although the cause and effect relationship of family circumstances and employment may be debatable, there can be little doubt that an individual's family situation is an important factor in his need for employment.

---

[1] O'Boyle theorized that ". . . family formation alters a young man's attitude toward work, making him more willing than the unmarried man to accept and hold a given job." (Edward J. O'Boyle, "From Classroom to Workshop: A Hazardous Journey." Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 91, No. 12, p.11).

Harwood, on the other hand, suggested that "Many (ghetto) boys are unemployed and subemployed because they value leisure as much as money. . ." (Edwin Harwood, "Youth unemployment--A tale of two ghettos," The Public Interest, No. 17, pp. 78-85).

Marital Status

At the time of interview, male subjects were more apt to be single than were female subjects, and subjects in the Experimental group were more apt to be single than those in the Control group (see Table 6.12).

Compared to female subjects in the Control group, female subjects in the Experimental group were significantly less apt to be married and living with their husbands at the time of interview (33 percent as compared with 43 percent). Most of the marriages reported by female subjects had occurred several years earlier.

TABLE 6.12

MARITAL STATUS AND MONTHS MARRIED, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II
BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Status and Months Married	Male		Female	
	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=212[a]	Con. N=142[a]
Marital status at time of interview:				
Single, never married	75%	64%	55%	44%
Married:				
Currently married	20%	28%	33%	43%
Separated, divorced, widowed	5	9	12	13
TOTAL	100%	101%	100%	100%
Ever Married:				
Months married, 7/1/69 (mean)	16.6	17.0	25.2	28.6
Married 12 months, or less (percent)	47%	36%	15%	16%

[a] Number of female subjects includes 7 self-reports in the Experimental group and 4 self-reports in the Control group as well as interviewed subjects.

Children

At the time of interview, subjects in the comparative study groups reported, on the average, the same number of children (see Table 6.13). Male subjects were very significantly less apt to report children than were female subjects; and female subjects were very significantly more apt to report two or more children.

About one-fourth of the female subjects who reported children also reported that none of their children had been born after July, 1966--a date representing the beginning of NYC enrollments in the Experimental study group (see Table 6.14). The close similarity between female subjects in the comparative study groups both with respect to numbers of children and with respect to children born after July, 1966, indicated that NYC enrollment had no effect on the fertility of these subjects.

TABLE 6.13

NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Number of Children	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=212[a]	Con. N=141[a]
	Percent		Percent	
None	69%	58%	25%	80%
One	19	36	34	39
Two, or more	13	6	41	41
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)
Average children per subject	.5	.5	1.3	1.3

[a] Number of female subjects includes 7 self-reports in Experimental group and 4 self-reports in Control group as well as interviewed subjects.

TABLE 6.14

CHILDREN, NUMBER BORN AFTER JULY 1, 1966, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Number of Children	Male		Female	
	Exp. N=20	Con. N=29	Exp. N=158	Con. N=113
None	5%	3%	25%	27%
One	65	90	50	50
Two, or more	30	7	26	23
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%

Children and Marital Status

Getting married and having children can be considered as milestones on the way to adulthood. In these terms, the most fully-adult study group was composed of female subjects in the Control group, 40 percent of whom were married at the time of interview and had children (see Table 6.15). This proportion was very significantly higher than that in the comparable Experimental study group. At the same time, significantly more of the female subjects in the Experimental group than of those in the Control group (38 percent, as compared with 28 percent) reported that they had children but had never married. Although female subjects in the comparative study groups were thus about equally involved in responsibilities for children, very significantly more of the young women in the Experimental group were, at the time of interview, the mothers in their own mother-only families.

Compared to female subjects, male subjects were very significantly less apt to report family responsibilities at the time of interview; and male subjects in the comparative study groups reported wives and children in approximately the same frequencies.

TABLE 6.15

CHILDREN AND MARITAL STATUS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Children and Marital Status	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=212	Female Con. N=142
	Percent		Percent	
No children reported				
Single, never married	59%	51%	17%	15%
Currently married	6	6	8	4
Formerly married[a]	3	1	-	1
Children reported				
Single, never married	16%	13%	38%	28%
Currently married	14%	22	26	40
Formerly married	2	7	11	12
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)

[a] Includes divorced, separated, and widowed.

Households at Time of Interview

Most of the male subjects were living in their "parental households"--households headed by their parents or other relatives--at the time of interview (see Table 6.16). Most of the female subjects, on the other hand, had left their parental households and were living in households headed by their husbands or in households which they themselves headed. Male subjects in the Experimental group were substantially similar to those in the Control group with respect to their households at the time of interview. Female subjects in the Experimental group, however, differed significantly from those in the Control group in that fewer of them reported living in "self and spouse" households and more of them reported living in "parental" households.

Compared to parental family units up to the time the subjects were 16 years old, the parental family units reported at the time of interview showed larger decreases in two-parent families than would have been expected. Mother-only families, on the other hand, were reported with greater frequency than would have been expected. These results lend some support to the idea that disorganized families impair normal developmental processes.[1] While they were growing up, 35 percent of the male subjects in the Experimental group, for example, reported that they lived in mother-only families; and, at the time of interview, 32 percent of these subjects reported that they were living in mother-only families even though--as a group--39 percent of these subjects had moved out of their parental households. In view of the fact that 69 percent of these subjects (see Table 6.17) reported that they supported themselves through their own earnings, it seems likely that their continuation in mother-only families was due to their mothers' financial needs rather than to the psychological effects of living in a disorganized family.

---

[1] Moynihan, for example, wrote: "White children without fathers at least perceive all about them the pattern of men working. Negro children without fathers flounder and fail." (D.P. Moynihan, The Negro Family (U.S. Department of Labor, March, 1965, p.81). Seven out of eight of the male subjects in the Experimental group reporting Mother-only families while growing up and at the time of interview were Negro.

TABLE 6.16

HOUSEHOLDS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
With whom are you living now?	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=212[a]	Con. N=142[a]
	Percent		Percent	
"Parental" households[b]				
Both parents	25%	22%	14%	15%
Father only	3	3	2	1
Mother only	32	23	23	13
Other relatives	10	13	7	7
Sub-total, "parental"	70%	61%	46%	36%
"Self households				
Living alone	13%	7%	21%	17%
Living with friends	0	4	1	4
Sub-total, "self"	13%	11%	22%	21%
"Self and Spouse" households				
Self and spouse	13%	22%	27%	39%
Self, spouse, and other adult relatives	5	6	5	4
Sub-total, "self and spouse"	18%	28%	32%	43%
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(0)	(1)	(0)

[a] Number of female subjects includes 7 self-reports in Experimental group and 4 self-reports in Control group as well as interviewed subjects.

[b] Reported by some currently married subjects whose spouses were absent in, for example, the Armed Forces.

Sources of Support at the Time of Interview

Most study subjects reported themselves to be financially independent of their parents (see Table 6.17). Among male subjects, a large majority--77 percent in the Experimental group and 80 percent in the Control group--considered themselves to be self-supporting.

Compared to male subjects, fewer female subjects were self-supporting. More than half of the female subjects in the Experimental group, however, reported that they were mainly dependent on their own sources of income as did 42 percent of the female subjects in the Control group. Welfare assistance was significantly more important to female subjects than it was to male subjects in this category. Significantly more female subjects in the Control group (41 percent) than in the Experimental group (29 percent) reported that they were mainly supported by their husbands.

Supplementary sources of support were reported by about one-fifth of the study subjects (see Table 6.18). Comparisons of all sources of support with main sources of support indicated that parental households augmented the resources of self-supporting offspring, to some extent; and that subjects primarily dependent on others added their own resources to family or spouse support.

TABLE 6.17

MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Main Source of Support	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=212[a]	Female Con. N=142[a]
	Percent		Percent	
Parental family				
Earnings	9%	12%	9%	12%
Welfare	2	3	2	1
Other[b]	2	1	2	1
Sub-total, family	13%	16%	13%	14%
Self				
Earnings	69%	68%	30%	23%
Welfare	3	0	17	12
Other[b]	5	12	8	7
Sub-total, self	77%	80%	55%	42%
Spouse				
Earnings[c]	9%	4%	29%	41%
Welfare[c]	2	0	1	1
Other[b]	0	0	2	1
Sub-total, spouse	11%	4%	32%	43%
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	99%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(1)

---

[a] Female subjects include 7 self-reports in Experimental group and 4 self-reports in Control group, as well as interviewed subjects.

[b] Includes pensions, unemployment compensation, disability payments, and irregular income.

[c] It is possible that some married subjects, identifying themselves as spouses, reported their own sources of support here.

TABLE 6.18

ALL SOURCES OF SUPPORT AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
All sources of support	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=212[a]	Con. N=142[a]
	Percent		Percent	
Parental family				
Earnings	14%	16%	15%	15%
Welfare	6	3	3	2
Other	6	1	3	1
Sub-total, family	26%	20%	21%	18%
Self				
Earnings	72%	74%	37%	35%
Welfare	3	1	19	13
Other	6	12	14	9
Sub-total, self	81%	87%	70%	57%
Spouse				
Earnings	11%	4%	31%	43%
Welfare	2	0	2	1
Other	0	0	4	2
Sub-total, spouse	13%	4%	37%	46%
TOTAL[b]	120%	111%	128%	121%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(1)

---

[a] Female subjects include 7 self-reports in Experimental group and 4 self-reports in Control group, as well as interviewed subjects.

[b] More than one source could be reported.

Welfare assistance was a relatively minor factor in the main sources of support of male subjects--only 7 percent of the male subjects in the Experimental group, and only 3 percent, in the Control group reported welfare (received by themselves, their wives, or their parents) as a main source of support. Up to the time they were 16 years old, however, welfare assistance was a larger factor--20 percent of the male subjects in the Experimental group, and 27 percent in the Control group reported that their families, in this period, had received welfare assistance all or most of the time. These results indicated that changing circumstances in their own or in their parents' lives had considerably reduced the amount of welfare dependence among male subjects.

Among female subjects, changes in the welfare picture were somewhat different. In the Experimental group, 27 percent of the female subjects reported that their families had received welfare assistance all or most of the time while they were growing up; and 20 percent reported that they were mainly dependent on welfare assistance at the time of interview. In the Control group, 23 percent of the female subjects reported welfare assistance while they were growing up; and 14 percent were mainly dependent on welfare assistance at the time of interview. Although there was thus some reduction in welfare dependence among female subjects, it was by no means as extensive as the reduction among male subjects. Furthermore, only those female subjects who reported themselves to be self-supported were considered, the proportion mainly dependent on welfare increased to 31 percent in the Experimental group and to 29 percent in the Control group.

Public Housing

At the time of interview, about one in five subjects--regardless of sex or study group--was living in public housing. This result indicated that approximately the same proportions of subjects in each study group qualified for and secured public housing and thus, in general, poverty was about equally prevalent in each study subgroup. At the same time, the fact that most of the subjects did not live in public housing could not be taken as an indicator of non-poverty. The dependence on welfare assistance already discussed, as well as the employment picture among study subjects that will be discussed in the following chapter, provided better guages of the economic status of study subjects.

Summary

The characteristics of study subjects as developed in follow-up information indicated that the comparative composite study groups of Prospective Study II were matched in a number of respects. Controlled on sex, subjects in the composite Experimental and Control study groups were substantially similar with respect to schooling completed, reasons for leaving school, and vocational preparation (other than in the NYC) outside of regular school. Male subjects in the Experimental group, however, tended to be younger than male subjects in the Control group--a characteristic that might tend to influence the employment adjustments of these subjects.

At the time of interview, most of the male subjects were earning their own way; and most of them, also, were still living in their parental family units. One-fifth of the male subjects in the Experimental group, and 28 percent of those in the Control group, were married. If, as has been suggested, the assumption of family responsibilities enhances employment adjustments, this characteristic might influence the employment adjustments of male subjects.

Significantly more of the female subjects in the Control than in the Experimental group were married and primarily dependent on their husbands. This characteristic might tend to reduce the relevance of employment adjustment criteria to female subjects. Among female subjects who were self-dependent, approximately three out of ten in both the Experimental and the Control group reported welfare assistance as their main source of support. For these young women, as well as for those earning their own way or contributing earnings to the family income, the achievement of satisfactory adjustments to the world of work might be the key to satisfactory adulthood.

Notwithstanding the paramount importance of employment to all young men and to many young women, the communities in which the study subjects grew up had provided them with relatively little preparation for the world of work. Most of the study subjects had dropped out of regular school, and very few had been able to complete high school by undertaking regular or part-time schooling. Opportunities for vocational training were rarely realized by study subjects. In academic as well as in vocational courses and programs, preparational failures could be attributed to two reasons: non-enrollment in these courses (by far the most prevalent reason); and non-completion after enrollment. There were some indications that male subjects in the Experimental group were somewhat more apt to enroll in courses, but this possible program effect did not result in more course completions.

Many of the characteristics discussed in this chapter were moderator variables in that they might influence outcome variables. Since these variables were quantified at a point in time subsequent to NYC experience in the Experimental group, it is possible that they represented, to some extent, program effects. In this chapter these variables were considered in terms of their effect on the study design, and the results indicated that subjects in the composite comparative study groups, controlled on sex, were substantially similar. The employment outcomes reported in the next chapter, therefore, can be considered generally within the framework of the study design.

VII

Outcomes of NYC Experience

This chapter reports study results describing the activities of Prospective study subjects at the time of interview in the summer of 1969 and in an 18-month period running from January, 1968, through June, 1969; together with comparable results from other units of this research. The activities of particular interest are those indicative of adjustments to the world of work: the non-NYC jobs of study subjects, the extent of unemployment among subjects in the non-NYC civilian labor force, and the bearing of non-labor force activities on subsequent employment adjustments.

Activities and circumstances indicative of the social adjustments of study subjects are also reviewed so that study results can be examined in terms of the study hypothesis that NYC experience improved the adjustment of enrollees to life and to the world of work. In the summer of 1969 study subjects were, on the average, around 21 years old. Many of the results are less conclusive than they might have been had they been based on data from a later period when study subjects would have been fully adult.

Activities at the Time of Interview

At the time of their 1969 follow-up, the only significant difference between comparative study groups in various activity categories was the higher proportion of male subjects in the Experimental group who were in military service (see Table 7.1). The activities of study subjects could be considered either as (1) consonant with satisfactory adjustments to adult life and the world of work (full-time employment, full-time homemaking, schooling, and vocational training) or (2) not consonant (part-time employment, unemployment, and jail). Approximately the same proportions of subjects in the comparative study groups reported activities that were consonant with satisfactory life adjustments (see Table 7.2). Considering only those subjects whose reported activities placed them in the non-NYC civilian labor force at the time of interview, there were no significant differences between the subjects in comparative study groups with the results controlled on sex (see Table 7.3). Compared to male subjects in the respective study groups, however, significantly more female subjects were unemployed and looking for work at the time of interview.

TABLE 7.1

ACTIVITIES AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II ALL QUALIFIED SUBJECTS,[a] BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Activities	Male Exp. N=86	 Con. N=81	Female Exp. N=214	 Con. N=144
	Percent		Percent	
Working				
In NYC	0%	0%	5%	0%
Full-time employment	36	51	34	42
Part-time employment	1	5	6	5
Not working				
Had job, laid off, on strike, etc.	2%	1%	–	1%
Looking for work	14	14	28	25
Not looking for work	9	4	9	11
Housewife not wanting work	0	0	11	11
In school or training program				
Full-time student	0	1	1	2
Part-time student	0	1	3	1
In Job Corps	3	1	–	0
In other vocational training program	1	2	4	1
In military service	23%	10%	0%	0%
In jail	8%	11%	0%	0%
Other				
Ill or disabled	1%	0%	2%	1%
Caring for a family member	0	0	0	1
On vacation	0	0	0	0
TOTAL[b]	98%	101%	103%	101%

---

[a] Subjects who were interviewed, returned self-reports, or for whom activity information was ascertained from other sources.

[b] Subjects could report more than one activity. In practice, very few did so.

TABLE 7.2

CONSONANCE OF ACTIVITIES AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW WITH "GOOD" ADJUSTMENTS PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Consonance and Activities	Exp. N=86	Con. N=81	Exp. N=214	Con. N=144
	Percent		Percent	
Consonant with good adjustments				
Full-time employment	36%	50%	32%	42%
School, vocational training[a]	5	6	13	4
Military service	23	10	0	0
Housewife not wanting work	0	0	10	11
Sub-total, consonant	64%	66%	55%	57%
Not consonant with good adjustments				
Part-time employment	1%	5%	5%	5%
Unemployed, laid off	16	15	28	26
Idle, not looking for work	9	4	9	10
In jail	8	11	-	0
Sub-total, not consonant	34%	35%	42%	41%
Other	1%	0%	2%	2%
TOTAL[b]	99%	101%	99%	100%

---

[a] Includes Job Corps and NYC.

[b] Totals reflect activities; that is, multiple activities have been distributed.

TABLE 7.3

LABOR FORCE STATUS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, ALL SUBJECTS IN LABOR FORCE[a], PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Status	Male Exp. N=46	Male Con. N=57	Female Exp. N=146	Female Con. N=105
	Percent		Percent	
Employed				
Full-time	67%	72%	49%	58%
Part-time	2	7	8	7
Unemployed				
Had job, laid off, etc.	4%	2%	1%	1%
Looking for, wanting work	26	19	42	34
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%

---

[a] NYC employment excluded.

Poor Outcomes

Unemployment was severe for all groups in both the Retrospective and Prospective studies. The average unemployment rate for males was around 25 percent for the various groups as shown in Table 7.4). For comparison purposes the results from a special study of Negro Male School Dropouts have been included.[1] Unemployment rates do not reflect the full extent of occupational maladjustment. Our data indicated that maladjustment is even more extensive in that a minimum of 45 percent of the male respondents in our studies who were not in school, training, or in the military were making a poor adjustment to adult roles. It is possible that a sizable proportion of the remaining 55 percent may be making a poor adjustment to the world of work with respect to pay, work performance, or liking for work.

The results for females indicated even more maladjustment with unemployment ranging between 34-50 percent and poor outcomes 50-61 percent (see Table 7.5).

---

[1] "A Study of Negro Male High School Dropouts Who Are Not Reached by Federal Work-Training Programs," (Social Research Group, 1970). The sample was selected by random numbers from Negro male school dropouts in St. Louis and Baltimore in the calendar year October, 1966-September, 1967. Subjects were eliminated from the sample if they were known to have participated in Federal manpower programs. Approximately 15 percent were eliminated for this reason. The interviews were conducted during the summer of 1969 and current activities were determined for 84 percent of the sample.

TABLE 7.4

CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, SELECTED STUDIES, MALE SUBJECTS

	Total[1] N	In Labor Market N	Age of Group Mean	Age of Group SD	Unemployed[2]	Poor Out-Comes[3]
Retrospective Experimental	192	123	21.9	1.41	23%	42%
Retrospective Control	182	112	22.4	1.79	26%	42%
Prospective Experimental	86	46	20.9	1.18	30%	49%
Prospective Control	81	54	21.7	1.47	21%	45%
Dropout Study	445	247	20.3	1.24	29%	47%

[1] Subjects whose current activities were determined

[2] Unemployed in Civilian Labor Market

[3] Poor outcomes include unemployed, looking or not looking for work; employed, part-time; and jailed. Subjects in military, school, or training programs were eliminated.

TABLE 7.5

CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF INTERVIEW, SELECTED STUDIES, FEMALE SUBJECTS

	Total N	In Labor Market N	Age of Group Mean[a]	Years Employed	Poor Out-Comes[b]
Retrospective Experimental	249	172	22.3	43%	57%
Retrospective Control	166	123	22.3	50%	61%
Prospective Experimental	214	136	21.6	41%	56%
Prospective Control	144	107	21.8	34%	50%

[a] Mean age at mid-point of interviewing period.

[b] Same definition as for males except "Housewife not wanting work" also eliminated

Full-Time Employment at Time of Interview

Among male subjects, there were no significant differences (see Table 7.6) between comparative study groups with respect to kind of work and average hourly pay reported in connection with full-time employment at time of interview. Compared to female subjects in the Control group, significantly more female subjects in the Experimental group reported full-time employment in Data Processing, Community, and Health work--kinds of work in which NYC programs often provided work and experience. These results indicated that the NYC may have increased the extent of employment for female enrollees in these occupational fields.

TABLE 7.6

KIND OF WORK AND EARNINGS IN CURRENT FULL-TIME JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Kind of Work and Earnings	Exp. Full-time N=31	Con. Full-time N=41	Exp. Full-time N=72	Con. Full-time N=61
Kind of Work[a]	Percent		Percent	
Clerical, Sales	10%	5%	29%	31%
Data Processing			10	3
Community Worker	0%	0%	4%	3%
Hospital, Health	6	2	25	15
Skilled Manual	32%	29%	3%	2%
Factory Work	13	5	8	14
Food Preparation, Services		5%	8%	8%
Semi-skilled (NEC)	3	27	3	7
Unskilled	36%	27%	10%	17%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)
Highest Hourly Earnings (average dollars)	2.24	2.07	1.86	1.79

---

[a] See Appendix I for more detailed description of occupational categories.

Activities in January 1968, and January, 1969

The activities of interviewed study subjects at two earlier points in time--January, 1968, and January, 1969--provided perspectives for their activities as reported in the summer of 1969. In general, these earlier cross-sections showed, as would be expected, increased participation in the non-NYC civilian labor force among subjects in the Experimental group. Among male subjects in the Experimental group, NYC activities declined from 21 percent in 1968 to six percent in 1969 and full-time non-NYC employment increased from 37 percent to 47 percent (see Table 7.7). Among female subjects in the Experimental group, NYC activities were down by 15 percentage points in 1969, and full-time non-NYC employment was up by 10 percentage points (see Table 7.8). In the Control group the activities picture was about the same at the two points in time, with 65 percent of the composite group in the civilian labor force in January, 1968, and 67 percent, in the force in January, 1969. Compared to January 1968, very significantly more of the composite Experimental group was in the non-NYC civilian labor force in January, 1969 (44 percent in 1968 and 56 percent in 1969), and the principal activity change among both male and female subjects had been a reduction in NYC participation. Recent backgrounds of NYC experience did not, apparently improve the full-time employment picture in the Experimental group (see Table 7.9).

TABLE 7.7

ACTIVITIES ON 1/1/68 and 1/1/69, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, INTERVIEWED MALE SUBJECTS BY STUDY GROUP

	Male Subjects			
	Exp.	(N=64)	Con.	(N=69)
Activities	1968	1969	1968	1969
	Percent		Percent	
In NYC	21%	6%	0%	0%
Employed full-time	37	47	54	61
Employed part-time	8	6	13	6
Not working, laid off, etc.	2%	2%	0%	0%
Not working, looking for work	11	13	12	9
In school, vocational training	5%	0%	10%	10%
In military service	14	14	4	3
Idle, not looking for work	2%	5%	7%	6%
In jail	2	5	0	6
Other	0%	3%	0%	0%
TOTAL	102%	102%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)

TABLE 7.8

ACTIVITIES ON 1/1/68 and 1/1/69, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, FEMALE SUBJECTS BY STUDY GROUP

	Female Subjects			
	Exp.	(N=205)	Con.	(N=138)
Activities	1968	1969	1968	1969
	Percent		Percent	
In NYC	31%	16%	0%	0%
Employed full-time	21%	31%	36%	42%
Employed part-time	2	1	4	7
Not working, laid off, etc.	1%	2%	1%	1%
Not working, looking for work	17	18	19	13
In school, vocational training	7%	7%	14%	10%
Housewife not wanting employment	7	9	12	13
Idle, not looking for work	10%	11%	11%	12%
Other	5%	4%	4%	1%
TOTAL	100%	99%	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(1)

TABLE 7.9

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF NON-NYC CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE IN JANUARY, 1968, JANUARY, 1969, AND TIME OF INTERVIEW, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, INTERVIEWED SUBJECTS BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP.

Labor Force and Full-Time Employment	Experimental			Control		
	Jan 1968	Jan 1969	Int 1969	Jan 1968	Jan 1969	Int 1969
Male Subjects						
Number in Civilian Labor Force[a]	36	43	46	54	52	57
Full-time employment (percent)	64%	70%	67%	69%	81%	72%
Female Subjects						
Number in Civilian Labor Force[a]	83	108	146	81	87	105
Full-time employment (percent)	52%	58%	49%	60%	66%	58%

[a] Excluding subjects reporting NYC employment. Labor force includes subjects reporting full and part-time employment, and those not working who were laid off or who were looking for work.

Activities in the 18 Months Following January 1, 1968

Returning to second-round interview data in the Prospective study, study subjects reported the time (to the nearest half-month) that they had spent in various activities for the 18-month period running from January 1, 1968 through June, 1969. As with the activity information previously reported, the average time spent in various activities in this period indicated that the adjustments of study subjects to life and the world of work often involved activities outside the non-NYC civilian labor force (see Table 7.10).

Excluding the time spent in the NYC, comparisons of the time spent, on the average, in various activities showed that male subjects in the Experimental group were similar to those in the Control group with respect to the weight of unemployment (see Table 7.11). Male subjects in the comparative study groups differed primarily with respect to civilian and military employment, with subjects in the Experimental group comparatively less involved in the former and subjects in the Control group comparatively less involved in the latter. These results are consistent with the finding that more male Experimental subjects were in the military at the time of interview.

TABLE 7.10

AVERAGE MONTHS IN ACTIVITY IN 18-MONTH PERIOD (1/68-6/69) LABOR FORCE STATUS AND CONSONANCE WITH GOOD ADJUSTMENTS TO LIFE AND WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Activity	Male		Female	
	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.
		Mean Months		
In NYC	1.7	0.0	3.4	0.0
In civilian labor force (non-NYC)				
Employed full-time	8.6	11.0	5.3	7.3
Employed part-time	1.1	1.2	.6	1.1
Had job, laid off, etc.	.4	.2	.3	.2
Unemployed, looking for work	1.3	1.7	2.7	1.6
Housewife wanting work			.7	1.2
Sub-total, in labor force (non-NYC)	11.4	14.1	9.6	11.4
Not in civilian labor force, consonant				
In military service	2.5	.6	0.0	0.0
In school full-time	.2	1.1	.3	1.3
In school part-time	.2	.3	.7	.4
In Job Corps	.3	.4	.1	.1
In other job training	.4	.4	.6	.4
Housewife not wanting work			1.2	2.3
Sub-total, consonant	3.6	2.8	2.9	4.5
Not in civilian labor force, not consonant				
In jail	.7	.7	0.0	0.0
Idle, not seeking employment	.9	1.1	2.2	2.0
Sub-total, not consonant	1.6	1.8	2.2	2.0
Other (sick, on vacation, etc.)	0.0	0.0	.7	.5
TOTAL[a]	18.3	18.7	18.8	18.4

[a] Subjects could report more than one activity and total could thus be more than 18 months.

TABLE 7.11

AVERAGE TIME IN NON-NYC ACTIVITIES AND PERCENT OF NON-NYC TIME IN ACTIVITIES, 18-MONTH PERIOD, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Average Time and Activities	Male		Female	
	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.
Average months in non-NYC activities	16.6	18.7	15.4	18.4
In civilian labor force				
Employed	58%	65%	38%	46%
Unemployed, looking for work	10	10	24	16
Not in civilian labor force				
In military service	15%	3%	0%	0%
In school or training program	7	12	11	12
Housewife not seeking employment	0	0	8	13
In jail	4%	4%	0%	0%
Idle, not seeking employment	5	6	14	11
Other	0	0	5	3
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	101%

Even though, in this study, NYC work had to be excluded from civilian labor force activities, the subjects who were working in the NYC during the 18-month period were, like the employed subjects in the Control group, earning their own way or, at least, earning some of their own support. The time spent in labor force activities, including the NYC (see Table 7.12) ranged from 63 percent of the 18 months (among female subjects in the Control group) to 78 percent (among male subjects in the Control group). The proportion of this labor force time that was spent in unemployment (laid off, or not working and looking for work) was substantially the same between subjects of the same sex in comparative study groups. Compared to those of male subjects, however, the unemployment percentages of female subjects were about twice as large.

Excluding the time spent in the NYC from the civilian labor force time base did not materially change the picture among male subjects. Among female subjects in the Experimental group, however, time spent in unemployment rose to 39 percent of the total time reported, on the average, in the non-NYC civilian labor force.

TABLE 7.12

COMPARISONS OF CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION IN 18-MONTH PERIOD PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Comparison Bases	Male		Female	
	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.
Average months in labor force including NYC	13.1	14.1	13.0	11.4
Average as percent of 18 months	73%	78%	72%	63%
Average months not working, looking for work	1.7	1.9	3.7	3.0
Average as percent of average months in force	13%	14%	28%	26%
Average months in labor force excluding NYC	11.4	14.1	9.6	11.4
Average as percent of 18 months	63%	78%	53%	63%
Average months not working and looking for work as percent of average months in labor force excluding NYC	15%	14%	39%	26%

These results suggested that the experiences of male subjects in the Experimental group (including their NYC experience) were as serviceable as the alternative experiences of the male subjects in the Control group in preparing male study subjects for the world of work. Among female subjects, on the other hand, these results suggested that NYC experience may have been more an alternative to unemployment than an effective preparation for the world of work.

Unemployment Among Female Subjects in the 18-Month Period

As a percentage of the average time spent in non-NYC labor force activities, the time spent in unemployment and looking for work was about the same for white female subjects in the Experimental and Control groups (see Table 7.13). Among Negro female subjects, on the other hand, subjects in the Experimental group averaged very significantly more of their labor force activity time in unemployment than did subjects in the Control group. The comparative disadvantage of Negro female subjects in the Experimental group in this respect was most pronounced in Durham and in St. Louis (see Table 7.14). In Cincinnati, the percentage of non-NYC labor force time spent in unemployment was very little larger in the Experimental group (29 percent) than in the Control group (23 percent). These results suggested that the achievement of post-NYC employment for Negro female enrollees was difficult; and that the NYC had been more effective in this respect in Cincinnati than in the other sites studied.

TABLE 7.13

PERCENTAGE OF NON-NYC CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE TIME IN 18-MONTH PERIOD SPENT LOOKING FOR WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, FEMALE SUBJECTS BY RACE AND STUDY GROUP

	White Female		Negro Female	
	Exp.	Con.	Exp.	Con.
Average time in non-NYC civilian labor force (months	8.2	8.4	9.7	12.5
Average time unemployed and looking for work (months)	1.8	1.5	3.5	2.5
Percent of labor force time spent in unemployment	22%	18%	36%	20%

TABLE 7.14

PERCENTAGE OF NON-NYC CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE TIME IN 18-MONTH PERIOD SPENT LOOKING FOR WORK, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, NEGRO FEMALE SUBJECTS BY SITE AND STUDY GROUP

	Experimental			Control		
	Cin'ti	Durham	St. L.	Cin'ti	Durham	St.L.
Average months in labor force	10.9	8.9	9.0	13.5	11.8	9.8
Average months unemployed	3.2	3.1	4.3	3.1	2.4	3.3
Percent of labor force time unemployment	29%	35%	48%	23%	20%	34%

Employment Since January, 1968

In the period from January, 1968, to the date of interview, most of the study subjects had held at least one non-NYC civilian job (see Table 7.15). In the first job in this period--the job held on January 1, 1968, or the earliest one thereafter--subjects in the Experimental group averaged about eight and a half months of employment, and subjects in the Control group averaged about ten months of employment.

TABLE 7.15

EMPLOYMENT SINCE JANUARY, 1968, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Variables	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=212	Female Con. N=142
Number of non-NYC civilian jobs				
None	17%	3%	32%	23%
One	27	30	45	34
Two	20	30	18	28
Three	17	18	3	8
Four, or more	20	19	2	7
TOTAL	101%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(3)	(2)	(1)
Had at least one non-NYC job				
Average number of jobs	2.6	2.4	1.5	1.9
Average months in first job	8.6	10.0	8.4	10.1

Most Recent and Current Jobs

The most up-to-date employment experience of study subjects was reflected in the jobs they had most recently held and in the jobs they currently held at the time of interview. Counting both work experiences, there were few differences between study subjects in the comparative study groups, controlled on sex (see Table 7.16). Significantly more of the male subjects in the Experimental group had current or recent jobs in Factory Work; and significantly more of the male subjects in the Control group had current or recent jobs in Semi-Skilled work. Otherwise, there were no significant differences between the comparative study subgroups.

TABLE 7.16

CURRENT AND MOST RECENT JOBS, SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Variables	Male Exp. N=53	 Con. N=67	Female Exp. N=144	 Con. N=109
	Percent		Percent	
Kinds of Work				
Clerical and Sales	8%	5%	26%	27%
Data Processing	2	0	6	2
Community Worker	0	0	3	2
Hospital, Health Service (NEC)	6	3	18	12
Skilled Manual (incl. apprentice)	21	25	2	1
Factory Work	21	6	6	11
Food Preparation and Service	4	9	18	19
Semi-Skilled (NEC)	4	20	3	6
Unskilled	36	31	18	21
Miscellaneous	0	2	0	0
TOTAL	102%	101%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Highest Average Hourly Earnings (dollars)	$2.12	$2.13	$1.69	$1.71
Average hours worked per week	42	42	39	39

Among male subjects, those in St. Louis reported the highest average hourly earnings in current and most recent jobs (see Table 7.17). while those in Durham reported the lowest average earnings. In the Experimental group, male subjects in St. Louis averaged $2.41 per hour while those in Durham averaged $1.94 per hour; and, in the Control group, male subjects in St. Louis averaged $2.46 per hour, while those in Durham averaged $1.75. Even though the number of male subjects was quite small in each site, these differences were large enough to be very significant. The number of male subjects in the several study sub-groups was too small to warrant more detailed analysis. It was, nevertheless, of interest that both Negro male and female subjects, on the whole, averaged rates of pay as high as the white subjects.

TABLE 7.17

HIGHEST HOURLY EARNINGS, CURRENT AND MOST RECENT JOBS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SITE, SEX, RACE, AND STUDY GROUP

Site and Sex	Experimental			Control		
	White	Negro	All	White	Negro	All
		Means			Means	
Male Subjects						
Cincinnati	$2.15	$2.06	$2.08	$1.83	$2.40	$2.25
Durham	1.61	2.03	1.94	1.86	1.67	1.75
St. Louis	2.34	2.43	2.41	2.16	2.55	2.46
ALL	2.03	2.14	2.12	1.90	2.24	2.13
Female Subjects						
Cincinnati	$1.74	$1.89	$1.88	$1.64	$1.85	$1.82
Durham	1.62	1.44	1.47	1.63	1.54	1.55
St. Louis	1.58	1.65	1.65	1.47	1.73	1.71
ALL	1.64	1.69	1.69	1.61	1.73	1.71

Among female subjects, also, those in Durham--in the Experimental as well as the Control groups--averaged significantly lower hourly rates of pay in their current and most recent jobs. Jobs for women paid significantly better in Cincinnati than in the other sites.

How Study Subjects Heard About Their Most Recent or Current Jobs

Most frequently, study subjects reported having heard about their most recent or current jobs from friends or relatives (see Table 7.18). Significantly more female subjects in the Experimental group--compared both to female subjects in the Control group[1] and to male subjects in the Experimental group--reported that they had heard about their most recent job through the NYC. The placement role of the NYC could be expected to disappear with the passage of time. At the time of interview, however, nearly one-fifth of the female subjects in the Experimental group had had no other jobs other than the ones to which they were referred when they left the program. Since male and female subjects in the Experimental group reported NYC placement help to about the same extent, the fact that only six percent of the male subjects in the Experimental group reported NYC as an information source in their most recent employment indicated that--compared to female enrollees--male enrollees were more apt to move into other jobs after their first post-NYC, program-assisted, placements.

---

[1] Some subjects in the Control group benefited from NYC referrals even though they did not actually enroll in the program.

TABLE 7.18

HOW HEARD ABOUT CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

How Heard	Male Exp. N=53	Male Con. N=67	Female Exp. N=144	Female Con. N=109
	Percent		Percent	
Friends or relatives	53%	62%	38%	48%
Public Employment Service	17	6	8	10
Private Employment Service	0	0	3	1
School	0	2	1	3
Neighborhood Youth Corps	6	3	18	3
Previous employer	4	2	7	5
Advertisements and announcements	6	5	13	9
Went to place of employment and applied	13	18	11	20
Other	2	3	1	2
TOTAL	101%	101%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)	(0)	(0)	(6)	(3)

Reasons for No Longer Having Most Recent Job

Subjects' reports of why they no longer held their most recent jobs (see Table 7.19) were substantially similar in the study sub-groups. Most frequently, subjects who no longer had their most recent jobs had been unable either to give or get job satisfaction (fired, job ended, problems with the job). Among female subjects, pregnancy was also an important reason for lost jobs.

TABLE 7.19

EMPLOYMENT AND REASONS FOR NO LONGER HAVING MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Employment and Termination Reasons	Male Exp. N=53	 Con. N=67	Female Exp. N=144	 Con. N=109
	Percent		Percent	
Employed at time of interview	60%	66%	58%	62%
Not employed, reasons no longer have last job				
Job ended	6	4	6	9
Was fired	8	7	2	2
Problems with job (pay, boss, etc.)	11	7	14	9
Pregnancy	0	0	10	12
Health	6	0	2	3
Returned to school or entered military	6	10	3	2
Was jailed	4	0	0	0
Moved	0	3	2	1
Unknown	0	0	2	0
TOTAL	101%	99%	99%	100%

Employers' Work Performance (EWP) Reports

As the most recent or current employers of study subjects were identified in completed interviews or self-reports, a short form was mailed to employers asking them to describe the work done by study subjects.[1] In a few instances (2 percent of all subjects who reported at least one job since January, 1968), employers were not sufficiently identified to permit mailing (see Table 7.20). For most of the most recent or current jobs, however, some employer information was available.

Approximately two-thirds of the EWP's were completed. About half of the non-completions involved the return of uncompleted forms either by the Post Office (addressee unknown) or by the putative employer (no record of subject's employment). These non-completions, attributable to poor locating information, impermanent businesses and poor records, suggested that EWP information would tend not to reflect casual employment and marginal employers.

A somewhat different situation was reflected in non-completions in which the EWP form was apparently successfully delivered by the Post Office but was not subsequently returned by the employer. In these cases, second and--if necessary--third mailings were undertaken. While some of these repeated mailings produced returns, from 15 to 21 percent (depending on the study sub-group) of the employers failed to respond in any way. This situation probably reflected inability to respond to some extent as well as unwillingness to cooperate.

---

[1] See Appendix G for a copy of The Employers Work Performance form (EWP).

TABLE 7.20

EMPLOYERS' REPORTS ON MOST RECENT OR CURRENT JOBS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Employers' Reports	Male Exp. N=53	 Con. N=67	Female Exp. N=144	 Con. N=109
	Percent		Percent	
Report Form Mailed to Employer				
Completed and returned	70%	61%	69%	66%
Not completed, but returned	13	15	11	15
Not returned	15	21	19	15
Report Form Not Mailed to Employer	2%	3%	1%	5%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	101%

Compared to subject-reported information (see Table 7.17), employers reported significantly higher average earnings ($1.81 as compared with $1.69) for female subjects in the Experimental group (see Table 7.21). Otherwise, so far as average hours worked per week and average hourly pay were concerned, employers' reports were in substantial agreement with subjects' reports. Differences between information from the two sources might be attributed to the selectivity of EWP information (omission of casual employment) and to the later date of EWP information (permitting the reflection of pay raises). Since there were no indications that more jobs were "selected out" among female enrollee-subjects, these results suggested that the current jobs of these subjects represented better employment adjustments than the current jobs of female subjects in the Control group.

TABLE 7.21

EMPLOYERS' REPORTS, MOST RECENT OR CURRENT JOB, SELECTED VARIABLES PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Variables	Male Exp. N=37	 Con. N=41	Female Exp. N=100	 Con. N=72
Hourly earnings (mean dollars)	$2.06	$2.02	$1.81	$1.75
Average hours worked per week	42	40	39	39

Employers' reports indicated that many of the jobs held at the time of interview (see Table 7.19) were no longer held at the time the EWP was completed (see Table 7.22). In each study subgroup, the percentage of EWP-current jobs was very significantly smaller than the percentage of interview-current jobs. Compared to male subjects, the decrease from interview-current to EWP-current employment among female subjects was significantly less. These results emphasized the instability of employment in the study population--particularly among male subjects. Assuming maintained proportions of employment, for instance, more than half of the EWP-current employment among male subjects would represent jobs taken since the date of interview.

As in the job separation reasons reported by study subjects, the job separation reasons reported by employers reflected employment maladjustments for the most part--impermanent jobs and failure to give or get job satisfaction (fired or quit). Compared to subjects' reports (see Table 7.22), employers' reports of job separation reasons gave significantly more weight to "fired" and significantly less weight to off-the-job reasons. Some of the reason categories were not exclusive: a subject, for example, might report that he left a job because he moved; whereas, an employer might not know about the move and report that the subject had simply "quit." Job separations due to firing, however, were specific and exclusive; and very significantly more of the employers' reports concerning subjects in the Control group and female subjects in the Experimental group gave "fired" as the reason for job separation (see Table 7.23). These results suggested that the acute employment maladjustment connoted by firing was more prevalent than would be inferred from subjects' reports.

TABLE 7.22

EMPLOYMENT AND REASONS FOR TERMINATION, EMPLOYERS' REPORTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Employment and Termination Reasons	Exp. N=37	Con. N=41	Exp. N=100	Con. N=72
	Percent		Percent	
Still employed	27%	22%	41%	42%
No longer employed, reasons				
Job ended	3%	7%	6%	13%
Was fired	14	24	14	8
Quit[a]	32	29	17	19
Left for better job, including promotion	8	2	0	1
Pregnancy or marriage	0	0	3	6
Health, family problems	3	2	5	4
Returned to school, entered military service	5	7	4	0
Moved	8	0	3	0
Deceased	0	2	0	0
Unknown	0	2	7	7
TOTAL	100%	97%	100%	100%

---

[a] Includes disagreements with other workers.

TABLE 7.23

REASONS FOR JOB SEPARATIONS, SUBJECTS' REPORTS AND EMPLOYERS' REPORTS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Sex of Subject and Reasons	Experimental		Control	
	Subjects' Reports	Employers' Reports	Subjects' Reports	Employers' Reports
Male Subjects (number)	(21)	(27)	(23)	(30)
Employment maladjustment:				
Fired	19%	19%	22%	33%
Job ended	14	4	13	10
Job problems, quit[a]	29	44	26	40
Other[b]	38	33	38	16
TOTAL	100%	100%	99%	99%
Female Subjects (number)	(57)	(52)	(41)	(37)
Employment maladjustment:				
Fired	5%	27%	5%	16%
Job ended	16	12	24	24
Job problems, quit[a]	35	33	24	38
Other[b]	44	30	46	22
TOTAL	100%	102%	99%	100%

---

[a] Includes reports of job problems in subjects' reports, and quits in employers' reports.

[b] Includes employers' reports of "left for better job" as well as reports featuring off-the-job situations (health, family problems, moved, returned to school, etc.).

Employers' Ratings of Overall Work Performance

Rated by their employers on a five-point performance scale running from "Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising" (1) to "Outstanding (5), male subjects averaged 2.7 and female subjects averaged 3.0 (see Table 7.24). Subjects in the comparative study groups elicited substantially the same overall performance reports from their employers.

TABLE 7.24

EMPLOYERS' RATING OF OVERALL WORK PERFORMANCE, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Performance Ratings	Male Exp. N=37	Male Con. N=41	Female Exp. N=100	Female Con. N=72
	Percent		Percent	
1-Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising	18%	26%	12%	10%
2-Unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement	24	11	16	15
3-About average	33	34	36	47
4-Average to good	21	29	30	22
5-Outstanding	3	0	7	5
TOTAL	99%	100%	101%	99%
Unknown (number)	(4)	(6)	(10)	(13)
Mean overall performance rating	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.0

10-Year Occupational Goals

Near the end of the interview, study subjects were asked what kind of work they would really like to be doing in 10 years' time (see Table 7.25). A surprisingly large proportion of subjects in each study group--from 17 percent among male subjects in the Control group to 37 percent among female subjects in this group--reported that they would like to be working as artists, businessmen, teachers, psychologists, and other professional, semi-professional, or entrepreneurial occupations. These proportions were surprising in view of the experience in and preparations for the world of work reported by these same subjects.

Apart from the high-level goals of the subjects who aspired to be professionals, male subjects most commonly named Skilled Manual work as their 10-year occupational goal and female subjects most commonly named Clerical Work as their goal. Relatively few of the subjects reported goals in the Semi-Skilled or Unskilled work areas. Responses of study subjects, controlled on sex, were substantially similar with respect to 10-year occupational goals.

Compared to the work performed in their current or most recent jobs, the occupational goals of study subjects were, for the most part, in completely different fields of work (see Table 7.26). At the same time, from one-fourth to one-third of the study subjects, depending on the study group, identified goals that could be developed from their work experience--goals that were either substantially the same as the work they had already performed, or goals that represented advancements in this work. There were no significant differences between the comparative study groups so far as these relationships of occupational experiences and goals were concerned.

TABLE 7.25

10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOALS, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Kind of work wanted in 10 years[a]	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=212	 Con. N=142
	Percent		Percent	
Professional, semi-professional, entrepreneur	25%	17%	28%	37%
Clerical	8	12	37	28
Data processing	3	1	5	3
Technician	2	0	6	1
Skilled manual worker	31	43	1	4
Machine operator	5	4	0	1
Semi-skilled worker	6	7	7	11
Unskilled and unspecific	8	12	3	4
General "success" goal	3	1	-	1
Not working	3	0	8	6
Don't know, undecided, and unknown	6	1	4	4
TOTAL	100%	98%	99%	100%

---

[a] See Appendix J for more detailed description of occupational categories.

TABLE 7.26

COMPARISON OF 10-YEAR GOAL WITH MOST RECENT JOB, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Comparison	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	 Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
About the same	15%	13%	22%	14%
Advancement goal in same occupational field	11	13	15	14
Different	74	74	63	72
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Information lacking for comparison (number)	(18)	(7)	(90)	(52)

Even though most of the study subjects had 10-year occupational goals that were, perhaps, beyond their capacities to achieve in that the goals required new job and training experience to be achieved, three-fourths, or more, of the subjects rated their chances of goal achievement as "very good" or "fairly good"(see Table 7.27). This general optimism concerning goal achievement was backed up by the fact that a little more than two-fifths of the subjects in each study group felt that nothing would hold them back from goal achievement (see Table 7.28). At the same time, almost as many subjects reported that they might be held back by inadequate education or training--impediments that many of them thought they might overcome, to judge by the proportions of subjects who considered their chances to be "fairly good" or better. It was of interest that very few subjects reported discrimination as an impediment to their goal achievement.[1] Subjects in the comparative study groups were substantially similar in these aspects of their career outlooks.

Interviewers' Ideas on Goal Achievement

Compared to study subjects, interviewers were somewhat less optimistic about the subjects' chances of goal achievement (see Table 7.29), in that interviewers gave fewer "very good" estimates in each group and--overall--their proportion of "very good's" was very significantly less than the corresponding subjects' proportion. For three out of five subjects in each study group, however, interviewers rated their chance of goal achievement as "fairly good" or better. In explaining their ratings, interviewers leaned heavily on the attitudes of study subjects to support goal achievement (see Table 7.30). Although about half of the interviewers' explanations backed up goal achievement by study subjects, "motivation," "confidence," "will to succeed," and the like were far more prominent than demonstrated ability (already has job that is his goal) or presumed adequate preparation (has, or is getting, requisite education or training).

---

[1] Discrimination was also very infrequently reported as an impediment to goal achievement in a study of Negro male school dropouts in two cities. See "A Study of Negro Male High School Dropouts Who Are Not Reached by Federal Work-Training Programs," (1970).

TABLE 7.27

SUBJECTS' ESTIMATES OF CHANCES OF ACHIEVING 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOAL
PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Chances	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=212	Con. N=142
1-Very good	31%	38%	35%	34%
2-Fairly good	45	40	39	43
3-Not so good	14	12	19	10
4-Unlikely	10	10	8	13
TOTAL	100%	100%	101%	100%
Unknown (number)	(6)	(1)	(13)	(11)
Mean chance	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0

TABLE 7.28

IMPEDIMENTS TO ACHIEVEMENT OF 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOAL, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

	Male		Female	
Anything holding you back?	Exp. N=64	Con. N=69	Exp. N=205	Con. N=138
Nothing holding me back	46%	42%	43%	49%
Impediments reported				
Inadequate education or training	35	42	46	37
Lack of opportunity, discrimination	2	0	2	2
Family problems	0	0	6	9
Military service	1	1	0	0
Personality characteristics ("myself")	2	1	3	2
Police record	4	4	0	0
Inability to pass entrance tests	2	4	0	0
Health, physical condition	7	3	0	2
Miscellaneous	2	1	0	0
TOTAL	102%	98%	100%	101%
Unknown (number)[a]	(7)	(2)	(15)	(15)

[a] Includes subjects not specifying occupational goals as well as no report.

TABLE 7.29

INTERVIEWERS' ESTIMATES OF CHANCES OF SUBJECTS ACHIEVING 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL GOALS PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Chances	Male Exp. N=64	Male Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	Female Con. N=138
	Percent		Percent	
1-Very good	21%	26%	25%	30%
2-Fairly good	40	38	42	30
3-Not so good	33	26	26	28
4-Unlikely	7	9	7	12
TOTAL	101%	99%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)[a]	(6)	(1)	(16)	(13)
Mean chance	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2

---

[a] Includes subjects not specifying occupational goals as well as no report.

TABLE 7.30

INTERVIEWERS' REASONS FOR GOAL ACHIEVEMENT ESTIMATES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II BY SEX AND STUDY GROUP

Reasons	Male Exp. N=64	 Con. N=69	Female Exp. N=205	 Con. N=138
Reasons supporting some likelihood of goal achievement				
Subject has, or is getting, education or training	17%	18%	10%	14%
Subject has shown requisite ability	3	7	12	9
Subject has attitudes that will promote goal achievement	28	31	36	28
Sub-total, supporting reasons	48%	56%	58%	51%
Reasons detracting from likelihood of goal achievement				
Subject lacks education or training, and money or opportunity to improve preparations	31%	15%	20%	24%
Subject lacks requisite ability	0	1	0	0
Subject's attitudes are inconsistent with goal achievement	9	21	10	12
Police record will stand in the way of goal achievement	5	1	0	0
Other impediments (health, family problems)	3	3	7	6
Sub-total, detracting reasons	48%	41%	37%	41%
Other and irrelevant	3%	3%	5%	7%
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%
Unknown (number)[a]	(6)	(1)	(17)	(13)

[a] Includes subjects not specifying occupational goals as well as no report.

Among male subjects, interviewers were significantly more apt to describe preparational impediments to goal achievement in the Experimental group, and significantly more apt to describe attitudinal impediments in the Control group. Among female subjects, interviewers described preparational impediments twice as often as attitudinal impediments in both study groups.

"Successful" and "Unsuccessful" Outcomes of NYC Experience

On the bases of activity and source of support at the time of interview, subjects in the Prospective II Experimental group were characterized as "successful" or "unsuccessful" in their adjustments to life and to the world of work. Subjects were considered to be "successful" if they were employed in non-NYC jobs at the time of interview and if their time-of-interview jobs had been held at least four months and paid at least $1.50 an hour. Subjects were considered to be "unsuccessful" if they were in jail or were not working at the time of interview and were principally supported by parental families or by welfare. These operational definitions of "successful" and "unsuccessful" outcomes identified one-third of the male, and 44 percent of the female, subjects (see Table 7.31). Most of the subjects thus were neither "successful" nor "unsuccessful" in these terms in that although their civilian labor market activities did not satisfy the criteria of "successful" adjustment to the world of work they nevertheless had avoided circumstances indicative of salient maladjustment.

TABLE 7.31

OUTCOME CATEGORIES, SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUPS, PROSPECTIVE II AND RETROSPECTIVE II, BY SEX

Outcome	Male		Female	
	Pro. II N=86	Retro. II N=141	Pro. II N=214	Retro. II N=247
	Percent		Percent	
"Successful"	16%	33%	21%	21%
"Unsuccessful"	17	28	23	46
Residual	66	39	56	33
TOTAL	99%	100%	100%	100%
Mean age at time of interview[a]	20.9	21.8	21.6	22.2
Mean highest school grade completed	9.3	9.4	9.8	9.9

[a] As of September 1, 1969, in Prospective II; and as of September 1, 1968, in Reprospective II.

Similar categorizations of outcomes were used in the analysis of Retrospective II results[1], and it was of interest that, compared to Prospective II results, the proportions of subjects who were neither "successful" nor "unsuccessful" were very significantly lower in Retrospective II results. Subjects in the Retrospective II study were older, on the average, than those in Prospective II, and it could be inferred that the passage of time was a factor in the overall extent of both "successful" and "unsuccessful" outcomes. Although results in the two studies were not exactly comparable--in addition to differences in subjects' age, one site (East St. Louis) was reflected in Retrospective II but not in Prospective II--these results suggested that (1) civilian labor force criteria of "success" have only partial application to young people in their early 20's; (2) the relevance of these criteria increases with time; and (3) even with the modest criteria of successful employment adjustments used in this analysis, very few of the study subjects were making it in the world of work by the time they were, on the average, about 21 years old.

---

[1] Operational definitions of "successful" were identical in Retrospective II and Prospective II. The Retrospective II definition of "unsuccessful" was limited to being unemployed and principally supported by welfare (own, spouse's, or parental family's welfare).

Factors in "Successful" Outcomes

Among female enrollees in the Prospective study, "successful" outcomes occurred with very significantly greater frequency than "unsuccessful" outcomes in Cincinnati (see Table 7.32), while, in St. Louis, the reverse situation was apparent with "unsuccessful" outcomes very significantly more frequent. Among female subjects, also, "successful" outcomes were positively associated with highest school grade completed and age. Cincinnati female enrollee subjects were six months older, on the average, than comparable St. Louis subjects; and they had completed, on the average, nearly a grade more in school.[1] Both of these differences were large enough to be statistically significant so that these characteristics of female enrollee-subjects could partially account for the greater frequency of successes in the Cincinnati program.

Compared to Cincinnati female enrollee-subjects, those in Durham had the same average age but averaged .9 less grades of school; and compared to St. Louis female enrollee-subjects, those in Durham had the same average schooling but averaged .6 more years of age. The proportion of "successful" outcomes among Durham female enrollee-subjects was not only less than that in Cincinnati and more than that in St. Louis; but, also, the Durham differences in this respect could be closely related to differences in schooling and in age. These results suggested that age and schooling were major factors in the differential occurrence of "successful" outcomes among female enrollee-subjects in the several sites.

[1] As of September 1, 1969, Cincinnati female subjects in the Experimental group averaged 21.8 years of age, while comparable averages in St. Louis and Durham were 21.2 and 21.8, respectively. When they first left school, these female subjects in Cincinnati had completed an average of 10.4 grades, while comparable subjects in St. Louis and Durham had completed 9.5 grades on the average.

TABLE 7.32

"SUCCESSFUL" (S) AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" (U) SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP SELECTED VARIABLES, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX

Variables	Male S N=14	Male U N=15	CL[a]	Female S N=46	Female U N=50	CL[a]
Site:	Percent			Percent		
Cincinnati	57%	60%	ns	57%	26%	***
Durham	29	13	ns	28	30	ns
St. Louis	14	27	ns	15	44	***
	Mean			Mean		
Highest school grade completed, first school dropout	9.4	9.2	ns	10.6	9.4	***
Years of Age as of September 1, 1969	21.1	21.0	ns	22.1	21.3	**

[a] CL=Confidence Level. *** indicates that difference could have occurred by chance no more than one time in 100; ** indicates that difference could have occurred by chance no more than five times in 100; and "ns" (not significant) indicates that difference could have occurred by chance more than five times in 100.

Outcome comparisons among male enrollee-subjects in the Prospective study indicated no significant differences between "successful" and "unsuccessful" subjects with respect to site, schooling, or age. In a similar comparative analysis undertaken in the Retrospective study, schooling was associated with outcomes for male as well as for female subjects. The fact that Prospective results failed to support the significance of schooling as a "success" factor for male subjects might be due to the small number of subjects rated as "successful" or "unsuccessful".

"Success" Factors--Program Information

Among both male and female subjects, "successful" outcomes to NYC experience were associated with single enrollments, first enrollments of more than 90 days, and--compared to "unsuccessful" subjects--higher average ratings of Overall Improvement in employability in the first NYC enrollment (see Table 7.33). Among female subjects, the comparative analysis of "successful" and "unsuccessful" subjects also showed that first enrollments of 91-180 days were associated with "success", but that longer first enrollments were about as apt to be associated with "unsuccessful" as with "successful" outcomes. Among female subjects, also, Overall Improvement ratings of "4" were significantly more frequent among "successful" enrollees.

TABLE 7.33

SELECTED VARIABLES, PROGRAM-SOURCED INFORMATION, "SUCCESSFUL" (S) AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" (U) SUBJECTS, IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP PROSPECTIVE STUDY, BY SEX

Variables	Male S N=14	Male U N=15	CL[a]	Female S N=46	Female U N=50	CL[a]
	Percent			Percent		
Single enrollment	100%	60%	**	98%	76%	***
Single assignment	93%	67%	ns	91%	81%	ns
Calendar days in first enrollment:						
90, or less	33%	72%	**	19%	51%	***
91-180	17	14	ns	38	13	***
181-360	34	7	ns	22	24	ns
361, or more	17	7	ns	22	11	ns
Overall Improvement, first enrollment						
1-None	17	38	ns	6	10	ns
2	0	8	ns	3	20	ns
3	25	38	ns	16	32	ns
4	33	15	ns	52	24	**
5-Great	25	0	ns	23	15	ns
Identifying information, post-NYC activity, first enrollment[b]	64	27	ns	39	38	ns
Mean Overall improvement, first enrollment	3.5	2.3	**	3.8	3.2	***

---

[a] CL=Confidence Level. *** indicates that difference would have occurred by chance no more than one time in 100, ** indicates that difference would have occurred by chance no more than five times in 100; and "ns" (not significant) indicates that difference could occur by chance more often than five times in 100.

[b] Names of post-NYC employer, school, or training program supplied by program at time of first termination from the NYC.

"Success" Factors--Interview Information

Compared to "unsuccessful" female enrollee-subjects, "successful" female subjects were very significantly more apt to be married and living with their husbands at the time of follow-up interviewing (see Table 7.34). "Successful" female subjects were also very significantly more apt to have heard about their current job through the NYC and were significantly more apt to have gotten a job in the NYC agency in which they worked.

NYC experience of from seven through twelve months was significantly associated with "successful" outcomes among female subjects, while "unsuccessful" female subjects more frequently had shorter or longer NYC experience. These results which reflected the enrollee's recall of total length of time in the NYC were consistent with the results reported in the preceding section which reflected program reports of first NYC enrollments and with previously reported results concerning program reports of NYC experience. Subjects with short first enrollments often terminated from the NYC before having made much improvement in employability; and, even when subjects re-enrolled and increased their length of NYC experience (since single and multiple enrollments were about the same length) their employability ratings tended to improve to "average" (3) but not above. Since "successful" outcomes among female subjects were very significantly associated with employability ratings of "4" and "5" and longer tenure did not often lead to these ratings (at least among multiple enrollment subjects), longer NYC experience as well as short NYC experience tended not to be associated with "successful" outcomes. The bi-modalism of length of NYC experience among "unsuccessful" female subjects was consistent with the views that (1) female enrollees required substantial employability inputs from NYC programs in order to achieve satisfactory employment adjustments, and (2) the extent of employability needs or the quality of programs was such that extensive program experience more often indicated persisting employability needs than adequately improved employability.

In neither the Prospective II or the Retrospective II outcome comparisons were there any significant differences in female subjects' ratings of aspects of NYC work experience.

Length of NYC experience in Retrospective II results was represented by means and indicated that "successful" female enrollees had significantly more NYC experience (11 months as compared with 10 months). The conclusion drawn from Retrospective II results in this connection, that length of experience was positively associated with "successful" outcomes, should be modified in the light of Prospective II results that indicated some limitations on this "success" factor. The Retrospective II conclusion that, among the program factors reflected in the comparisons (work experience, help from supervisors and counselors, and placement), NYC placement help was the only program factor significantly associated with "successful" post-NYC employment adjustments was borne out by Prospective II results so far as female subjects were concerned.

TABLE 7.34

SELECTED VARIABLES, INTERVIEW INFORMATION "SUCCESSFUL" (S) AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" (U) SUBJECTS IN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP, PROSPECTIVE STUDY II, BY SEX

Variables	Male S N=14	Male U N=15	CL[a]	Female S N=46	Female U N=50	CL[a]
	Percent				Percent	
Marital Status						
Married, living with spouse	21%	20%	ns	39%	3%	***
Post-NYC job in NYC agency	21	10	ns	26	7	**
How heard about most recent job						
Public Employment Service	14%	43%	ns	2%	22%	ns
Friends	50	43	ns	25	50	***
NYC	14	0	ns	32	0	***
Other	21	14	ns	41	28	ns
Months in the NYC						
0-6	43%	50%	ns	26%	39%	ns
7-12	7	20	ns	43	20	**
13-36	50	20	ns	30	41	ns
		Mean			Mean	
Months in the NYC	14	10	ns	11	12	ns
Ratings[b]						
Liking for NYC work	3.9	3.8	ns	4.5	4.3	ns
Importance of NYC work	4.1	4.0	ns	4.6	4.2	ns
Helpfulness of work supervisor	4.1	4.6	ns	4.2	3.9	ns
Helpfulness of counselor	3.9	4.1	ns	4.2	3.8	ns
Usefulness of NYC experience	4.2	4.6	ns	4.6	4.2	ns
Age as of September 1, 1969	21.1	21.0	ns	22.1	21.3	ns

[a] CL=Confidence Level. ***=significant at .01; **=significant at .05; ns=not significant at .05 or above. None of the differences in measures relating to male subjects was significant.

[b] Ratings on 5-point scales running from least ("1") to most ("5").

Although none of the differences between "successful" and "unsuccessful" male subjects in the Prospective II outcome comparisons was statistically significant, it was of interest that, in both Retrospective and Prospective comparisons, more "successful" than "unsuccessful" male subjects got post-NYC jobs in NYC agencies--15 percent as compared with three percent in the Retrospective results and 21 percent as compared with 10 percent in the Prospective results. The difference was statistically significant in the Retrospective results which involved more subjects and it is reasonable to consider the Prospective results as supporting this significant difference between "successful" and "unsuccessful" male subjects.

Summary

Unemployment was found to be severe for Experimental and Control groups in both the Retrospective and Prospective studies, 21-30 percent for males and 34-50 percent for females, depending on the group. Unemployment rates were found not to reflect the full extent of occupational maladjustment since they do not include part-time employment, unemployed persons not looking for work, and persons in jail. When these categories are taken into consideration, the percent of subjects with a poor outcome increases substantially, 42-49 percent for males, and 50-61 percent for females.

Only minimal overall program effects were observed. Retrospective study results showed that Experimental subjects were more self-supporting than their Controls; Prospective study results showed little differences between comparative study groups except for finding that NYC experience had improved the quality of employment for female enrollees to some extent by opening up jobs in Community and Health Service work.

While only limited overall program effects were observed, several specific effects were noted: The most successful program observed was the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op which showed that a formal skill-training program combined with work experience can achieve far more employment effectiveness than can the generality of NYC work experience programs. Work sites with training and employment opportunities, job development and assistance with job placement also appeared to be associated with increased post-NYC employment.

Comparisons of "successful" and "unsuccessful" outcomes of NYC experience indicated that the program factors associated with "success" included productive adjustments to NYC experience and NYC help in post-NYC job placements. The quality of NYC work experience, as reported by the enrollees, was not associated with "successful" outcomes in that "unsuccessful" as well as "successful" enrollees tended to give high ratings to their NYC experience. These results were similar to those obtained in "successful"—"unsuccessful" comparisons in the Retrospective study.

VIII

Conclusions and Implications

The conclusions reported in this chapter are based on the results of all of the research undertaken by the Social Research Group in its evaluation of the effectiveness of selected, urban, out-of-school NYC programs. This research included the following units:

Retrospective study This study made use of comparative study groups--Experimental groups composed of individuals with NYC experience and Control groups composed of individuals similar to those in the Experimental group except for NYC experience. Subjects in the Experimental group of this study enrolled in the NYC in the fall and winter of 1965-66. Two rounds of follow-up interviewing were conducted, the first in 1967 and the second, in 1968.

Prospective study This study also made use of comparative study groups. Subjects in the Experimental group of this study enrolled in the NYC in the latter part of 1966 and in the early months of 1967. The NYC experience of these subjects was followed as they participated in the program, and two rounds of follow-up interviewing were conducted. First-round interviews in 1968 involved subjects in the Experimental group, and second-round interviews in 1969 involved subjects in both comparative study groups.

Termination study This study was based on termination samples and follow-up information was secured through mailed questionnaires to terminated enrollees.

Clerical Co-Op study This study was based on an enrollment sample of enrollees in a specialized skill training program. Follow-up information was secured through questionnaires and interviews.

Accelerated Learning Experiment This was a demonstration research study of an experimental approach to remedial education in three cities.

Work-Relevant Attitude Measurement Development This research involved the development of scales for the measurement of attitudes relevant to productive adjustments to the world of work.

Follow-up information was obtained from subjects in the Retrospective and the Prospective studies, the Termination study and the Clerical Co-Op study. In the Retrospective study, follow-up information was secured concerning 83 percent of the 528 enrollees and ex-enrollees in the four research sites comprised the composite Experimental sample. Follow-up information concerning 66 percent of the composite Control group of 524 youth was secured. In the second-round of the Retrospective study interviewing, follow-up information was available for 81 percent of the Experimental group and for 72 percent of the Control group. In the Prospective study, first-round follow-up information was available for 81 percent of the composite Experimental sample of 470 subjects. In the second-round of interviewing, East St. Louis was eliminated and follow-up information was obtained for 80 percent of the subjects in the Experimental group and for 70 percent of the subjects in the Control group. In the Termination study, a completion rate of only about 40 percent of mailed questionnaires was achieved. This study was methodologically useful, however. In the Co-Op study, follow-up information was secured for 96 percent of the 127 subjects who comprised the study group.

Evaluation of Primary Hypothesis

The primary hypothesis of the research -- that the NYC programs studied had helped enrollees to achieve satisfactory adjustment to life and to the world of work -- was not confirmed. An early conclusion that the NYC seemed to be most effective with Negro females was not supported by later data. First-round of interviewing in the Retrospective study showed that female, but not male, Experimental subjects had significantly less unemployment than the Controls. In the second-round of interviewing, however, no significant differences in unemployment were found for either males or females, although in the Retrospective but not in Prospective study, both were found to be more self-supporting than their Controls.

Although there was no clear evidence of the effectiveness of the NYC in enhancing the employability of the average enrollee, there was evidence that some program components appeared to be having a significant effect. Formal skill training, work sites with training and employment opportunities, job development with assistance with job placement appeared to be associated with increased post-NYC employment.

Since this research was undertaken, the NYC has been re-organized. The present program, NYC-2, contains some of the modifications suggested by the research described in this report. The experience of NYC-2 programs thus may provide tests for some of the recommendations developed in this research.

Enrollee Characteristics and Employability Needs

Most of the enrollee-subjects in this research were young persons who had dropped out of school in the 10th grade or earlier. They lacked academic credentials for the world of work and they had received very little vocational preparation in school. Their experience with the world of work was often very limited, and uniformly unsuccessful in that all subjects were jobless when they enrolled in the NYC. If employability is conceptualized as consisting of vocational and academic skills and on-the-job behaviors compatible with job performance in a desired occupational field, then these predominant enrollee characteristics indicated pervasive employability needs in the areas of vocational skill, remedial education, and the acquisition of satisfactory work habits.

Attitude-associated employability problems could be inferred to some extent from several aspects of the data. Experiences in school differed broadly between male and female subjects. Male subjects averaged less schooling and were more apt to have left school for reasons (academic or disciplinary) that connoted maladjustment to the school system. Female subjects, on the other hand, were more apt to have left school for reasons that did not necessarily connote maladjustment to the school system. Considered as an indication of socialization, school experience suggested that--compared to male subjects--female subjects would be more adequately socialized and would have fewer attitudinal impediments to successful participation in the world of work training and of work.

The first impressions that enrollee-subjects made when they enrolled in the NYC indicated that they were generally very friendly and interested and most of them optimistically believed that they would achieve their occupational goals. At the same time, enrollees often gave the impression of timidity or under-confidence.

Most of the enrollees who served as subjects in this research were females. Female subjects were more apt to have completed high school, or 11th grade, than male subjects, and were more apt to have had vocational preparation in school. This preparation was almost exclusively for clerical work, and clerical work was the most frequently reported occupational goal of female subjects.

Many of the female subjects were unmarried mothers, and their family responsibilities lent urgency to their employability needs. At the same time, family responsibilities often interfered with the NYC participation of these subjects and restricted their employability.

Among male subjects, the most frequently reported occupational goals were in Skilled Manual Trades, and their direct employability needs were the acquisition of performance skills that were occupationally relevant. As with female subjects, when occupational interests could not be served--either because of grossly inadequate backgrounds or because of lack of program resources--their employability needs involved the acquisition of skills and interest in work areas within their reach. Most subjects, both male and female, were black. Realistically, their employment needs sometimes included help in breaking into segregated occupational fields. In addition to the acquisition of requisite performance skills, particular placement help was needed in order to realize employability.

Program Characteristics and Employability Inputs

Standard NYC experience involved three program components: work experience, remedial education, and counseling. In general, work experience was the major component and the major source of enhanced employability in the areas of increased vocational skills or improved work habits. These employability inputs depended, in large measure, on the character of the programs' agencies--worksites in the non-private sector that provided supervised work experience to enrollees. Some specialized skill training, however, was provided in the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op and in industry trainee arrangements developed in other sites. In terms of staffing, counseling was a distinct component that might be associated with personal or attitudinal areas of employability needs. NYC counseling also served to reinforce experience in other components, with the counselor functioning as a monitor and liaison agent, and other personnel--supervisors or teachers were often closely associated with counseling inputs. In addition to the inter-related inputs of work experience, remedial education, and counseling, some of the programs developed special job development or placement resources.

Male enrollees were most frequently assigned to cleaning, maintenance, and unskilled labor workslots. The acquisition of relevant vocational skills thus was minimized for male enrollees, and the work-experience potential of enhanced employability tended to be limited to improvements in work habits.

Female enrollees were most frequently assigned to clerical and professional aide workslots. Compared to male enrollees, female enrollees more often had work experience in occupational areas relevant to their vocational interests and they were more apt to gain vocational skills in the course of their work experience.

Relatively few enrollees returned to full-time school or passed the high school equivalency examination. The amount of involvement in remedial education varied considerably between sites, with St. Louis and Durham placing most emphasis on this component.

NYC counseling was a minor part of NYC experience in terms of hours involved and in terms of enrollee appreciations of the value of counseling. Since counseling merged with other program components, and since its qualitative input was not necessarily related to quantitative measures or to enrollee perceptions, this component of NYC experience was difficult to assess. Counselor changes were so frequent as to reduce the personal impact of individual counselors in many instances.

The shortness of much NYC experience and the often generalized nature of employability enhancements in the program implied that many enrollees terminated from the NYC before achieving substantial gains in their employability. Terminations to school or to other work-training programs, or re-enrollments in the NYC, thus would seem to be of crucial importance to the achievement of enhanced employability. Enrollees were not more apt than non-enrollees to participate in post-dropout schooling or in training programs other than the NYC, however, and most NYC experience consisted of a single enrollment. Program records indicated that 44 percent of the enrollees in the Prospective study had first enrollments of three months or less. Compared to enrollee reports, program records of the length of NYC experience generally indicated shorter experience, and thus emphasized the often superficial character of NYC experience so far as treating basic employability needs was concerned.

Program Achievements

The NYC programs studied were reaching seriously disadvantaged young persons and providing them with experience that ranged from short-term emergency employment to extended and comprehensive preparations for the world of work. Apart from enhancing employability, the objectives of the NYC included temporary financial help to these young persons and the performance of useful work for the agencies that provided worksites for the program. There can be little doubt that the latter two objectives of the NYC were realized. So far as substantial benefits to the enrollee were concerned, however, enhanced employability was the primary objective of the program; and study results indicated that this objective had not been generally achieved.

Long-term NYC enrollments did not increase the probability that the enrollee would achieve post-NYC employability. Second-round interviews in the Retrospective study, for example, showed that "unsuccessful" male subjects had significantly longer NYC enrollments than did "successful" male subjects; and second-round interviews in the Prospective study indicated that longer enrollments among female subjects were not significantly associated with "success". For some enrollees, NYC enrollment may have served as a refuge from the requirements of jobs in the outside world, and their NYC experience, even though lengthy, did not increase their competence to deal with these requirements. These results were consistent with the view that work experience, as such, in the NYC-1 format did not enhance the employability of enrollees with very substantial employability needs.

Enrollees generally gave a good report of the usefulness of their NYC experience. In view of the widespread lack of employment among subjects at the time of interview--particularly among female subjects--the subjects' context of usefulness was clearly wider than employability. The good reports given to the NYC by former enrollees indicated that the programs studied had created a reputation that would keep them in touch with their client populations. Most of the enrollees in the present research had heard about the NYC from their friends, and it could be projected that, in the future, they--in turn--would serve as sources of information to new cohorts of enrollees.

The interviewing results suggested that white youth who enrolled in the studied programs were more disadvantaged than Negro enrollees in that the white youth averaged a year less school completed and were given a lower rating by intake interviewers on appearance, speech, poise and self-confidence.

Negro females were by far the biggest group of enrollees and stayed in the program the longest period. This predominance of Negro females suggested that modifications of program reach--for example, the involvement of relatively more males or more white youth--might require recruitment emphases directed towards these young persons. Without recruitment changes, future programs--like those in the present research--will probably tend to serve Negro females to the exclusion of Negro males and whites.

In the course of this research, some results suggested that the NYC programs studied might "work better" for Negro female enrollees than for enrollees in other race-sex subgroups. This tentative conclusion was based on the predominance of Negro female enrollees in the Experimental study groups and on a number of male-female comparisons. Compared to male enrollee-subjects, for example, female subjects were older and better educated, averaged higher ratings to aspects of NYC experience, had longer NYC enrollments, and were more apt to have work assignments in vocationally relevant occupational areas. Second-round Prospective study results did not support this conclusion in that the proportions of unemployment among female subjects in the Experimental and Control groups were substantially the same. In the light of these results, it seems reasonable to conclude that, except for skill-training programs like the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op, the NYC fitted the needs of Negro females for emergency employment; but that, for the subgroup as a whole, NYC experience fell short of measurably enhancing employability.

Although this research was directed towards the determination of the effectiveness of NYC programs, results indicated that the young people in both comparative study groups were experiencing extensive unemployment. Depending on the research unit, unemployment rates ranged upward from 20 percent among male subjects, and from 34 percent among female subjects. The full range of outcomes, furthermore, indicated even more extensive maladjustments to life and the world of work, in that some activities outside the labor market (and hence not reflected in rates of unemployment) clearly indicated maladjustment. Counting such activities (jailed, not working and not looking for work) together with part-time employment and unemployment, upwards of 42 percent of the male subjects, and upwards of 50 percent of the female subjects were out of the mainstream of productive activity. These results indicated that young persons in this population, regardless of their NYC experience, often were not making it in life by the time they had reached, on the average, the conventionally adult age of 21 years. The extent of persistent employability problems in both the Experimental and Control groups emphasized the importance of study results identifying areas of employment effectiveness in the NYC programs studied.

Factors in Employment Effectiveness

Worksites that provided training and post-NYC employment, and NYC-assisted placements were associated with employment effectiveness. These results indicated the importance of establishing a realistic employment context for NYC training. Schooling and age were also associated positively with post-NYC employment. These results emphasized the seriousness of the programs' general failure to provide effective remedial education, and the importance of maintaining contact with younger enrollees terminated from the NYC before they had achieved an adequate preparation for the world of work.

These factors in employment effectiveness suggested that formal skill training would be more effective than the generality of NYC work experience programs. Such a program was developed in the Cincinnati NYC, and was studied in a unit of this research.[1] The results of the study indicated that this clerical skill-training program effectively enhanced the employability of enrollees. The effectiveness of this program warrants its consideration as a model that, with appropriate modifications, might serve to increase the effectiveness of NYC experience for other enrollees.

---

[1] See Appendix L for an abstract of the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op Study.

Implications for Improved NYC Operations

The results of this research have direct implications for improved NYC operations. These implications are discussed below in the form of seven principal propositions. Some of these implications have been recognized in the modified NYC-2 programs; and, to the extent that they have been incorporated in work-training programs, the propositions provide hypotheses that can be tested in future research.

1. The employability of enrollees is enhanced primarily through vocationally relevant NYC experience.

2. Enrollees can be categorized according to their needs and differential program strategies can be developed.

3. The educational needs of enrollees require active and innovative intervention.

4. The continuation of counseling responsibility into the post-NYC period can improve employment adjustment of former enrollees.

5. Combinations of multiple assignments, multiple enrollments, and maintained work standards may give the best results for many enrollees.

6. NYC enrollment policy that concentrates on "hard core" youth might tend to limit program affectiveness.

7. Maximum effectiveness of program operations is achieved through a balance of program components.

These seven propositions are discussed in detail below.

1. The employability of enrollees is enhanced primarily through vocationally relevant NYC experiences.

NYC work experience as such had no appreciable effect on the employability of enrollees. It was only when the work experience was directly relevant to a post-NYC job that positive effects were noted. Other components of the NYC program also had noticeable effects only when they were job-related. More sophisticated criteria of program effectiveness and more sensitive measurements might, in future studies, show other positive effects; but it seems unlikely that the importance of vocational relevance will be superseded as the primary factor in program effectiveness. Realistic vocational objectives, therefore, should be held in close and continuous focus. Post-NYC employment, the primary goal of the NYC program, can be achieved through three main kinds of program operations: job development, the provision of vocationally relevant work experience, and formal skill training. These operations are discussed below as sub-propositions.

a) Effective job development is essential to NYC effectiveness

Effective job development involves locating job opportunities, working with employers to expand available opportunities and helping enrollees improve their job seeking behaviors. Our research results indicate that this type of assistance is essential for some enrollees.

Public employment agencies, have developed programs to help disadvantaged groups, but our results indicate that, for the most part, they are not yet giving substantial assistance to the types of youth enrolled in the NYC programs. There seems to be a conflict between the point of view of employment agencies and the NYC stemming from different criteria for judging program success. The number of successful placements has been the traditional standard by which an employment agency judges its performance. The employer becomes the most important client to be satisfied, and the best way to satisfy him is to send qualified candidates for all job openings. When poorly qualified candidates are sent, the employer may stop using the employment agency for recruitment. Under these circumstances, there may be a tendency for employment counselors to be reluctant to refer the typical out-of-school enrollee for a job since these youth are frequently employment risks.

For the NYC, the most important client is the youth himself, and the criteria of success should be the number of youth it can place successfully into jobs. Risks have to be taken; the eventual adjustment of the youth to the world of work is more important than the job failures which may occur while the youth is learning to make this adjustment.

If effective job placement resources are not available, local NYC programs have no alternative but to undertake job development themselves. Job developers serve as employment brokers between NYC enrollees and employers. On the one hand, they must represent the interests of enrollees by directing the enrollees toward available opportunities, expanding the opportunities as much as possible, and helping the enrollee to maximize his chances of having his employment application accepted. On the other hand, the job developer needs to represent the interests of employers by keeping the risks of failure within reasonable limits through the referral of candidates who have a reasonable prospect of achieving success on the job. The degree of risk can be decreased by combining job development and placement, and, after the enrollee has been placed on the job by providing follow-up counseling.

b) Vocationally relevant work assignments are essential to NYC effectiveness

Although the employability help needed by some enrollees involved only job placement assistance, the majority of the enrollees needed far more help. Most enrollees needed to acquire the skills and motivation that would provide reasonable assurance of satisfactory job performance before placements could be considered. NYC work assignments could, in theory, supply work samples and on-the-job skill training. In practice, NYC assignments were often limited--particularly for male enrollees--to types of work that involved few skills, and the potential of NYC work experience was largely unrealized. Better results might be achieved if NYC assignments provided a variety of vocational experiences, each of which was relevant to existing employment opportunities.

The number of work assignments of each type should correspond as closely as possible to the anticipated needs and interests of the enrollees. For example, if it is anticipated that 20 percent of the enrollees could benefit from clerical assignments, an effort should be made to have 20 percent of the work assignments in the clerical field. Work assignments should also provide specific training in skills which are in demand in the employment market. The most effective arrangement is one in which employment opportunities are available at the work site, after the enrollee has shown he is able to perform the work. Good results can still be achieved, however, if the work assignment trains the enrollee for work for which there is a ready market. On the other hand, poor results are likely to follow work assignments that do not lead to employment, even though the work itself may be interesting.

The character of supervision in a work site may be as important to training as the kinds of job skills that can be acquired in the site. On the basis of our observations during this research, we have concluded that a work supervisor who shows an interest in the enrollee is likely to achieve the best results. This personal interest, however, must be combined with discipline and insistence on adequate performance. The best work assignment is one in which the work is well-organized and the fellow workers of the enrollee are conscientious and work efficiently. The worst work situation is one in which the supervision is lax and the fellow workers have poor work habits. For this reason, it has been observed in one of the programs studied that better results were obtained in private industry assignments than in assignments in non-profit agencies, which often are not well-managed.

c) Formal skill training combined with work experience can in many circumstances achieve good results.

Training in certain types of skills sometimes can be accomplished more efficiently through formal skill-training programs than through on-the-job training. The combination of the two is often an ideal arrangement. The formal training program develops a minimum level of competence in basic skills required by the job and work experience provides practice in applying these skills in work situations. The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op program is a good example of a successful program of this type.[1] This program alternates cycles of work experience in firms that are potential employers and training in relevant skills and behaviors in the NYC Educational Center.

---

[1] See Appendix L for abstract of the Co-Op study.

The Co-Op study design included follow-up reports from employers. One of these employers, a firm with headquarters in Cincinnati and district offices in a number of southern and eastern cities, returned the follow-up data with the following appreciation of the Co-Op program:

> We have been working with the Neighborhood Youth Corps for approximately one and one-half years on a cooperative work study program for clerical employees. The program consists of alternating one month study periods in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in which the trainees learn typing, business English, arithmetic, business machines, etc., and one month work periods with ____________ Company where the trainees do typing and miscellaneous clerical work. The program lasts for a total of six months, with three months being spent in the Neighborhood Youth Corps School Program and three months working for our firm. We have found this to be a most successful program and have hired five girls from the Neighborhood Youth Corps as permanent employees in our firm. Without exception these girls have proven to be successful, promotable employees.
>
> We feel the interesting aspect of this to be that these girls when they first come to us, neither have the skills or poise to properly adapt to an office atmosphere; however, after six months of the Co-Op program they are at a level of any normal employee that we would hire on to our work force.
>
> It is my opinion and I know that of our company, that this is a vital program and every effort should be made to continue it in our community. If there is further information regarding this that would be helpful to you, please don't hesitate to contact us.

The success of the Clerical Co-Op suggests that it might serve as a model, with appropriate modifications, in other vocational areas. In extending the application of such a formal skill-training program, the following elements should be considered as essential:

1. Selection of job categories for which there are ample employment opportunities and training at a minimal level of competence can be accomplished within six months.

2. Initial training at a Training Center for a period of three to six weeks.

3. On-the-job training for a period of about four weeks, preferably at a work site that provides opportunities for permanent employment.

4. Reassignment to Training Center, concentrating on work deficiencies reported by work supervisor during last work assignment.

5. Provision for remedial education as required.

6. Continuation of the cycle of work experience and formal training until enrollee has been judged ready for employment. Enrollee should be reassigned to a new work site whenever this appears to be necessary.

7. Assistance in obtaining a job after training has been completed.

8. Follow-up counseling until enrollee has made an adequate adjustment to a job.

2. Enrollees can be categorized according to their needs and differential strategies can be developed.

The employability needs of enrollees cover a wide range. It seems apparent that a useful program approach to enrollee employability needs is to adapt the program elements--work assignment, counseling, and remedial education--to meet these needs.[1] It is, of course, not possible to tailor the NYC to fit each individual's needs. Broad strategies or "program mixes" can be developed, however, which permit a flexible response to enrollee employability needs and promise a higher degree of program effectiveness.

We have noted three general areas of deficiency--lack of opportunity, rebellious attitude toward authority, and low self-esteem. Some deficiencies result from inadequacies in the opportunities for educational experiences available to the youth both in the formal school system and through family experience. These are examples of system failures harmful to the individual regardless of his attitude or motivation. Within this category are two subtypes, a disadvantaged graduate group and an adverse situation group. Many disadvantaged youth have graduated from the school system without having learned the basic language skills necessary to function in jobs. We call this the disadvantaged graduate group. Other well-socialized individuals drop out of school because of situational factors such as pregnancy or the need to support their families. We term this the adverse situation group. Such individuals have been caught in circumstances beyond their control and need the opportunity to fill gaps in their formal education.

---

[1] See Appendix K for case studies illustrating various employability need and program element situations.

A second area of deficiency results from a poor attitude toward authority and work. Many disadvantaged youth have a suspicious attitude toward persons in authority and have not developed sufficient self-discipline to be able to meet the requirements of a job. We call this the rebel group. These youth feel that persons in authority are against them. They feel their needs cannot be met by complying with the requirements of authority. Until their attitudes change, they have great difficulty fitting into a working environment.

The third area of deficiency is related to the self-concept of individuals coming from deprived environments--the low self-esteem group. Having had unfortunate experiences in the past, they tend to view the world as hostile and antagonistic, and to have doubts about their own capacity to obtain satisfactions from the world. Youth in this group, while frequently needing the most help, often may be the most difficult to assist. It appears the best strategy for improving self-esteem is to provide opportunities for experiencing success and to help the individual interpret these successes.

Possible differential strategies of program "mix" are discussed below:

a) Disadvantaged Graduate Group

It is a regrettable fact that there are many graduates from ghetto schools who have not learned the basic skills necessary to function adequately in jobs above the unskilled level. They frequently have a reasonably good academic record and are suffering from deficiencies in the educational system rather than from their own failure. Also, they may be weak in job-seeking skills or suffer from employment discrimination. Our research shows that Negro females comprise a great majority of this group. These enrollees are already sufficiently well-motivated and disciplined to profit from formal education and skill training. The primary emphasis for this program "mix" should be on skill training and supplementary educational preparation rather than on work attitude. These enrollees may also need vocational guidance and help in finding a job.

b) Adverse Situation Group

Youth in this category usually have a good attitude toward authority and work but have dropped out of school because of some situational factor. Examples are youth who have dropped out of school to help support their families or girls who became pregnant and were unable to continue their education. Such individuals have been caught in circumstances beyond their control and need an opportunity for additional education or training. With this group, the primary emphasis in the program component "mix" should be on skill training and helping the enrollee obtain a high school diploma or its equivalent rather than on the improvement in work attitudes. Both the disadvantaged graduate and the adverse situations groups tend to have good attitudes toward training and work. The major difference between them is that the adverse situation group usually needs to stay in the program for a much longer period of time in order to remedy formal educational deficiencies.

c) Rebel Group

Youth in this group get along reasonably well with their peers and are able to perform well in many activities, despite their poor performance in school and their history of delinquency. The first task of the NYC program is that of social conditioning or convincing the youth that they can function in and obtain satisfactions from legitimate areas of society. For these youth, the prime motivator at the beginning of the program is probably the money. For the program to be effective, however, it is necessary that their values be shifted from those of the delinquent subculture to values more in harmony with those of the prevailing culture.

Counselors or work supervisors can have a significant influence by serving as role models for such youth who also need to change their attitudes toward authority and the requirements of work. They need to develop the self-discipline necessary to function in the world of work. Supervisors should be encouraged to require such enrollees to meet the standards of achievement which are an essential ingredient of successful work performance. At this stage, counseling plays an important role.

The counselor should be aware of the relationship between the enrollee and his work supervisor, and should be available to both of them for advice and interpretation. At this level, guided group interaction as a counseling technique could prove very useful because youth are much more likely to listen to comments made by the peer group than by adults in positions in authority. Thus, the peer group may serve as a reference group to influence a change in norms and help the youth to understand reaction to his "delinquent" behavior.

At this stage, the program "mix" should be a combination of work experience and different forms of counseling with the work supervisor performing an important part of the counseling function. Remedial education is not likely to be very effective until favorable attitudes toward authority or favorable self-concepts are developed. It is likely that the school dropout already has developed a negative attitude toward the school system and other socializing agents and will not be able to learn effectively until this attitude has been changed.

d) Low Self-Esteem Group

Youth in this group, while frequently needing the most help, are often the most difficult to assist. Many of them dropped out of school at an early grade, possess deficiencies in behavioral skills, and often have severe personality problems. The extremely withdrawn or aggressive youth may have such serious intra-personal conflicts that it is not possible to work with him in the conventional manner.

It appears that the best strategy for improving self-esteem is to provide the opportunity for success experiences and to help the individual interpret these successes as worthwhile accomplishments. Earning money, completing a task, contributing to a common goal are all possible ways for an individual to experience success. During the period in which he is developing a sense of accomplishment and a belief that he can contribute to his own satisfaction by performing work, it is almost inevitable that some of the behaviors which have led to previous failures will lead to failure again. It is important, therefore, that he be able to fail without seriously adverse consequences. He needs to be able to start afresh in a new situation on at least several occasions so that he may have a chance to break the vicious cycle of repetitive failures resulting from his conviction that failure is inevitable.

The greatest need for the youth in the low self-esteem group is for sheltered work experience with sympathetic supervisors who do not make excessive demands on him. At this stage in his development, the youth may not be able to profit from intensive counseling. The role of the counselor, therefore, should be to place him in the kind of work situation which will help build his self-confidence (without putting excessive strain on him), and to help him interpret his progress and recognize his achievements. As the youth begins to develop self-confidence and his performance improves, additional demands can be made upon him and the program component "mix" should change accordingly.

At the time the youth enrolls in the program, he should be classified according to his type and a prescription prepared outlining a strategy for meeting his needs, such as counseling goals, desirable work experience, and remediation needs. His experience within NYC should be evaluated in relationship to this prescription and changes made in the prescription as better understanding of the enrollee is achieved or his needs change.

As one of the elements in this research, an instrument was developed for measuring work-relevant attitudes.[1] It is hoped that when fully developed, this instrument will be useful for individual diagnosis in terms of the above typology as well as helping to design and evaluate programs in terms of attitudinal change.

---

[1] See Appendix M for abstract of this study.

3. The educational needs of enrollees require active and innovative intervention.

A high proportion of enrollees, including the high school graduates, were so deficient in reading and arithmetic skills as to severely limit their employability. Thus, work-training programs, although valuable for providing credentials and for training individuals in work habits and job skills, need to be supplemented by a remedial education program in order to reduce deficiencies in basic education and to enable the enrollee to handle a responsible job. In terms of these educational needs of the enrollees, the NYC educational component was generally inadequate--particularly for male enrollees. In order to improve the effectiveness of remedial education, NYC programs have two alternatives: (1) the stimulation of local school systems to the end that they will provide an effective resource, or (2) the development of NYC educational capacities.

Education provided by local school systems may tend to be ineffective because of underlying attitudes based on past experience: many schools have, in effect, rejected the school dropout (encouraging him to leave and making it difficult for him to return); and many dropouts have rejected schools. Both of these attitudes may need to be modified before effective remedial education can be achieved. The critical nature of enrollees' unmet needs for effective remedial education led to a demonstration unit in this research--the Accelerated Learning Experiment.

The results of this study indicated that an effective remedial education program should take into account the following considerations:

a) The teacher should be prepared to counsel the enrollee on his social, education, and employment problems since the problems are interrelated.

b) Many enrollees, particularly males, have negative attitudes toward school and schooling. Part of this negativism is associated with the enrollee's low estimate of his own ability to do school work, and with low thresholds of frustration and boredom. Educational material should be neither so difficult as to frustrate nor so easy as to deny a sense of achievement, but should be just difficult enough to provide a challenge. Programmed learning plus diagnostic procedures for placing the student at his proper level appear to offer the best prospect for achieving the goal of avoiding frustration and giving the student a sense of progress. This combination of techniques allows the student to be placed at a level appropriate to his needs and permits him to work at his own pace.

c) Enrollees, although they may be approximately the same age, may be expected to have a wide range of academic dificiencies--from functional illiteracy to near readiness for high school graduation. The educational program must maximize flexibility by being able to include within the same class students working at several different levels of achievement.

d) The site of a remedial education program may be of crucial importance to its effectiveness. The negativism often attached to the standard school environment has been noted; but the rejection of schooling by dropouts also frequently means that the enrollee considers schooling to be irrelevant to his concerns. Since the level of motivation to participate in further education is often low, it becomes essential that the time and place for the classes be as convenient as possible. These psychological and physical considerations suggest that, to the extent practical, remedial education classes be located at or near NYC work sites and the class schedule should be coordinated with NYC work hours. Conversely, when planning work sites, the needs of the remedial education program should be considered.

e) A recent study[1] has shown that certified teachers are not essential to a learning situation involving programmed learning materials and the type of disadvantaged students found in the NYC. High school graduates can perform satisfactorily as teachers providing they have the necessary personal qualifications, and more extensive teaching qualifications--with attendant recruitment difficulties--are often not necessary.

The Accelerated Learning Experiment in three cities indicated that motivation of the enrollee is almost certainly the most important variable determining whether he will participate effectively in educational programs. The research results indicated that a significant portion of the enrollees are extremely difficult to motivate and that the educational goals of the program, therefore, must be modest if there is any reasonable prospect of their being achieved. Many enrollees have short attention spans, are easily discouraged, and have difficulty mastering an academic task. If they are required to attend formal educational classes, even though they are paid for their time, they are likely to benefit very little and may leave the program.

---

[1] Greenleigh Associates, Inc. Field and Test Evaluation of Selected Adult Basic Educational Systems. (New York: September, 1966).

For these reasons, three levels of remedial education should be offered to trainees with tie-ins made between the various levels so that enrollees can progress from one level to another. The first level should be directed toward enrollees with minimal motivation and should be specifically related to the job that the enrollee is to perform and should have the limited objective of improving his performance in a specific job. It should be the trainee's first full-time assignment for a three- to six-week period prior to his first work assignment and, in addition to the three R's, should include relevant work procedures or work samples, family-financial management, personal counseling to prepare each enrollee for employment, and career orientation and planning.

The second level of education should be directed toward the remediation of education deficiencies of the trainee with emphasis still placed on making the educational task relevant to work but the education should continue over a longer period of time and be supplemental to work experience.

The third level of remedial education, concentrated preparation for the high school equivalency test, should be available for all of those who are adequately motivated and whose educational achievement can be raised in a reasonable time to passing of the high school equivalency examination.

4. The continuation of counseling responsibility into the post-NYC period can improve the employment adjustment of former enrollees.

There are many indications that terminated enrollees are often deficient in their skills, attitudes, and knowledge of the requirements of the working world. Even though such an enrollee may terminate to "permanent" employment, he can be found in the ranks of the unemployed some months later.

The follow-up interviewing identified a number of ex-enrollees who might have been helped to a satisfactory work adjustment if they had received advice and support during the difficult first months of post-NYC employment. The markedly higher rate of unemployment in first-round, as compared with the second-round, interviews also indicated substantial need for employment help in the first year after NYC.

Systematic follow-up counseling was not provided routinely, although some counselors indicated that they maintained informal contacts with former enrollees. It seems likely that the effectiveness of the NYC program could be increased by providing counseling assistance to ex-enrollees during their first post-NYC months. If, as will sometimes prove to be the case, ex-enrollees fail to achieve satisfactory employment, the NYC counselor could help as an "opportunity broker"--enrolling the youth in training programs, helping him to find satisfactory employment or re-enrolling him in the NYC without delay if he needs further NYC work experience.

5. Combination of multiple assignments, multiple enrollments, and maintained work standards may give the best results for some enrollees.

Seriously disadvantaged youth often need a number of chances--if a single opportunity were enough, most of them could succeed without special assistance programs. The NYC provides extra opportunity to disadvantaged youth, but the NYC itself should utilize the second--and, even, third and fourth--chance concept of offered help. Many enrollees quit the NYC for the very reasons that will prevent them from achieving satisfactory employment: they can adjust no better to work training than to the world of work. For such enrollees, termination is a form of program failure and a furlough, with the opportunity to start again, regardless of the past, holds more promise of program effectiveness.

Furloughs also can effectively reinforce policies of maintained standards in NYC enrollments. Our data indicate that it is important to maintain reasonable work standards. Excessive leniency and excessive strictness tend to reduce the value of work experience; the former by failing to provide the enrollee with objective standards, and the latter by providing standards that are too high or too strictly maintained. Furloughs could provide reinforcement of NYC standards and, at the same time, preserve the program's commitment to the temporarily separated enrollee.

Some supervisors and counselors, entirely sympathetic to NYC enrollees, mistakenly overlook poor enrollee performance. Their rationale would seem to involve the hope that continued contact with the enrollee, with the opportunity to provide continued support and counsel, would bring about spontaneous enrollee improvement. Our data suggest that supportive measures without maintained standards are rarely effective; and that the best results are achieved when reasonable standards are maintained.

Follow-up data contained many examples of youth who had been terminated because of poor attendance, attitude, or performance on a single assignment and who rated the NYC highly. Many of these youth had been unemployed continuously and, perhaps, they were nostalgic for NYC paychecks. In view of their post-NYC attitudes, however, it is possible that they would perform better in a second enrollment. This possibility is supported by the fact that some enrollees took as many as four separate enrollments before achieving successful adjustments to the NYC.

The above considerations suggest the need for a new concept of enrollment in the NYC. Perhaps, once having been enrolled, a youth should be considered a responsibility of the NYC until it has been established that he can hold down a full-time job or until the program administrator determines that the NYC program can provide no further assistance to him. Such a policy should be combined with the requirement that an enrollee be permitted to continue in a work assignment only as long as he meets reasonable standards of performance for that job. When he fails to meet these standards, he should be placed on furlough until he decides he is ready to return and to comply with the standards. When he has made this decision, he should be given a new work assignment as soon as possible if he appears sincere in his decision to try to meet work standards.

The use of the concept of furlough rather than that of termination indicates that withdrawal from the program is not negative or to be stigmatized as failure. Rather, it has constructive implications for the enrollee and for the program. The furlough concept puts the responsibility on the enrollee to decide to adjust to the NYC program if he is to return. This gives him an alternative and allows him to learn to profit from a mistake instead of punishing him for it. Thus, a "failure" on one job becomes a part of the growth process through which behavior may be modified.

Although the consistent application of standards serves to discipline the enrollee, the door of the NYC would be kept open until it appears that the program cannot meet the youth's needs.

6. NYC enrollment policy that concentrates on "hard core" youth tends to limit program effectiveness.

A frequently advocated enrollment policy assigns priority to youth with the greatest employability problems. These "hard core" youth, it is argued, have the greatest need for NYC experience and should be helped before youth with less severe employability problems are enrolled. Our data indicate that such a policy generally tends to decrease program effectiveness, including program effectiveness for "hard core" youth.

The NYC is most effective, as might be expected, with disadvantaged youth who are relatively close to employability--the top layer of the program's client population. These youth can be given realistic assistance and program concentration on them can be expected to provide the most remediation at the least cost. Program successes achieved in this way, furthermore, develop a reputation of effectiveness that serves to increase the motivation of future enrollees. Achieved employment effectiveness of an NYC program increases its potential effectiveness for all enrollees, including the "hard core" youth.

The successes in the NYC have been achieved primarily with the enrollees who have already shown that they are able to regulate themselves to some degree. Success is associated with school grade completed and with age, both of which can be considered measures of maturity. On the other hand, very little success has been achieved, except in isolated cases, with the individual who is severely maladjusted. Perhaps, through use of more intensive and ingenious procedures, it might be possible to have a significant effect on the hardest of the "hard core" but the cost can be expected to be very high. Working on the group which can be given immediate assistance has the direct advantage of having greatest impact on the employability of disadvantaged youth at the least cost. It also has the indirect advantage of demonstrating that results can be achieved and that the program can be helpful to the enrollee. One of the reasons that disadvantaged groups have low motivation is that they see little hope for themselves, and a program which concentrates on the "hard core" will have little apparent effect and thus will not materially change the enrollee's perception of what is possible for him. A program, on the other hand, which also includes the almost employable can show significant results which will be apparent to the next layer of unemployed youth and will serve as a practical demonstration to them that it is possible for people like themselves to obtain interesting and meaningful jobs.

7. Maximum effectiveness of program operations is achieved through a balance of program components.

There is an interaction effect among program components which makes it essential that the time be distributed over all essential program elements and not concentrated on favored components. For example, effective job development increases the value of counseling by providing an attainable goal. Effective counseling increases the value of job development by improving the attitudes of enrollees and thus making it more likely that the enrollee will be able to perform well on the job. Effective job development and counseling will increase the value of remedial education by raising an enrollee's motivation and making it more likely he will try to learn. Conversely, effective remedial education will increase the job qualifications of the enrollee. The NYC program administrator needs to use a systems approach to the planning of his program and needs to pay close attention to the need for balance. Guidelines for developing a program model are suggested below:

a) The point of departure for program planning should be realistic job opportunities in the community. The activities of the NYC should be directed toward preparing the youth for employment and the NYC experiences should be perceived by the enrollee as having an employment pay off.

b) The NYC administration should first locate or stimulate the development of essential services like job development and remedial education. In the absence of adequate services within the community, they should be provided as component parts of the NYC program.

c) Remedial education should be tied in as closely as possible to the counseling and work experience components of the program.

d) Work sites should be sufficiently concentrated in one geographic area to permit adequate counseling and remedial education.

e) Work assignments should provide training opportunities and should offer a sufficient range of work to meet the needs of the enrollees.

f) Work supervisors used in the program should take an interest in the enrollees, be capable of giving them on-the-job training, should maintain a work-oriented atmosphere, and should insist that reasonable standards be met. The qualities of the work supervisor as related to the needs of the enrollee should be considered when work assignments are made.

g) Counselors should use intervention strategies based on the differential needs of the enrollees and should be responsible for enrollees until they demonstrate the ability to hold a job or until a decision is made that nothing further can be done for them.

h) Periods of enrollment should be used constructively. Enrollees should not be permitted to continue working when they do not meet reasonable standards but should be permitted to return to the program when it appears that they are serious about wanting to work. It should be expected that many enrollees will need to start over again with a clean slate several times before they are ready to seek outside employment. Sometimes the clean slate can be provided by a reassignment. Other times, the enrollee will need to be put on furlough until he is ready to try again.

i) Enrollees should be given assistance in finding jobs. Job opportunities should be expanded, enrollees directed to suitable job vacancies and taught how to apply for a job.

The recommendation contained in this paper are based on research of the NYC-1 program in five cities. Since the time reflected in these studies, the NYC program has been re-designed and many of the changes are in line with the above recommendations. A second longitudinal study is currently underway to examine the effects of the changes resulting from the re-design and to investigate further the relationship between program policies and operations and program effectiveness.

APPENDICES A through M

APPENDIX A

Initial Interview Form
(SRG/NYC 01)

5 pages

B.O.B. No. 44-6628
Exp. 7/30/67

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University

Initial Enrollee Interview Form
SRG/NYC 01 Page 1

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
3 4 5 6 7

I. ENROLLEE DATA

A. NAME (print) ____________________
(last) (first) (middle-maiden)

B. TELEPHONE ____________ ____________
(number) (name)

C. PARENT OR GUARDIAN :

Name (print) ____________________
(last) (first) (middle-maiden)

Address ____________________
(number) (street) (city) (state)

Telephone Number ____________

D. ALTERNATE PERSON KNOWING WHEREABOUTS:

Name (print) ____________________
(last) (first) (initial)

Address ____________________
(number) (street) (city) (state)

Telephone Number ____________

E. SCHOOL LAST ATTENDED ____________________
(name) (place)

F. IN METROPOLITAN AREA 0-6 Mos. ___(1) 7-12 mos. ___(2) 13-24 mos. ___(3)
8
2-5 yrs. ___(4) 6-10 yrs. ___(5) 11, or more yrs. ___(6)

G. IN PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD 0-6 mos. ___(1) 7-12 mos. ___(2) 13-24 mos. ___(3)
9
2-5 rs. ___(4) 6-10 yrs. ___(5) 11, or more yrs. ___(6)

Note: This information is being obtained as part of a research study conducted by The George Washington University under a contract with the Department of Labor and the information will be kept confidential.

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

H. LIVED MOST OF TIME BEFORE AGE 16 In a large city (pop. 100,000
10
or more) ___ (1) In a suburb of a large city ___ (2) In a middle-sized or small city (pop. less than 100,000), but not in a suburb of a large city ___ (3) In a small town of less than 10,000 ___ (4) In the open country, but not on a farm ___ (5) On a farm ___ (6)

I. ESTIMATED ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME (please check)
11

Below $1,000 ___	$5,000 - $5,999 ___
$1,000 - $1,999 ___	$6,000 - $6,999 ___
$2,000 - $2,999 ___	$7,000 - $7,999 ___
$3,000 - $3,999 ___	$8,000 or more (amount)
$4,000 - $4,999 ___	$ ________

J. NUMBER OF PERSONS DEPENDENT ON FAMILY INCOME ____
12-13

K. OCCUPATIONAL PREPARATION IN (please check) High School ___ 14 Business School ___ 15 Trade School ___ 16 Adult Education ___ 17 Armed Forces ___ 18 OJT ___ 19 MDTA ___ 20 Job Corps ___ 21 NYC ___ 22 Other(specify) ________________________________ 23 No occupational preparation ___

IF OCCUPATIONAL PREPARATION, please give course and achievement

Course ________________________________

Achievement ________________________

Course ________________________________

Achievement ________________________

Course ________________________________

Achievement ________________________

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

L. WHAT WORK CAN YOU DO NOW? ______________________________
24-25
____

M. HOW WELL CAN YOU DO IT? ______________________________
26
____

N. HAVE YOU EVER HELD A JOB FOR 30 DAYS OR MORE? Yes ___ (1) No ___ (2)
27

O. IF HELD JOB BUT NOT NOW WORKING, REASON (please check)
28
Job ended ___ (1) Quit ___ (2) Was fired ___ (3) Moved ___ (4) Jailed ___ (5)
Ill health ___ (6) Back to school ___ (7) Other (specify) ______________________________
______________________________ (8)

P. MOST HELP IN GETTING LAST JOB (please check) State Employment
29
Service ___ Private Employment Agency ___ School ___ Friends
or relatives ___ Previous employer ___ Advertisements ___
Other (specify) ______________________________ (7)

Q. IF NEVER HELD JOB, MAIN REASON (please check) Hunted, couldn't find
30
job ___ (1) Couldn't find a desirable job ___ (2) Didn't look for a job ___ (3)
Other (specify) ______________________________ (4)

R. ENROLLEE"S LIFE-TIME OCCUPATION GOAL ______________________________
____

S. ENROLLEE'S ESTIMATE OF CHANGES OF ACHIEVING GOAL (please check)
32
Excellent ___ (1) Reasonably good ___ (2) Slight ___ (3) Unlikely ___ (4)

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

II. INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSIONS

A. ENROLLEE'S APPEARANCE (please rate by circling appropriate number)

33	Inappropriate Dress	1	2	3	4	5	Appropriate Dress
34	Dirty	1	2	3	4	5	Clean
35	Unkempt	1	2	3	4	5	Neat
36	Poor Posture	1	2	3	4	5	Good Posture
37	Unhealthy Appearance	1	2	3	4	5	Healthy Looking
38	Awkward	1	2	3	4	5	Poised

B. ENROLLEE'S SPEECH

39	Mumbles	1	2	3	4	5	Speaks Clearly
40	Halting	1	2	3	4	5	Fluent
41	Ungrammatical	1	2	3	4	5	Good Grammar
42	Unpleasant Voice	1	2	3	4	5	Pleasant Voice
43	Accent or Dialect	1	2	3	4	5	Standard Speech

C. ENROLLEE'S ATTITUDE

44	Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	Friendly
45	Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	Interested
46	Timid	1	2	3	4	5	Confident

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

D. PLEASE RATE ENROLLEE'S OCCUPATIONAL GOAL Low ___ (1) Reasonable ___ (2)
47
Unrealistically high ___ (3)

Why? ______________________________

____

E. DOES ENROLLEE HAVE ANY OBVIOUS PHYSICAL HANDICAPS? Yes ___ (1) No ___ (2)
48

If yes, describe ______________________________

III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

____
Interviewer

____
Date

APPENDIX B

Work Supervisor Report Form
(SRG/NYC 02)

6 pages

B.O.B. No. 44-6628
Exp. 7/30/67

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University

Enrollee Work Performance
SRG/NYC 02 Page 1

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

I. WORK ASSIGNMENT

A. NAME (print) ______________________________________
(last) (first) (middle-maiden)

B. WORK STATION ______________________________________
8-9 (name)

C. SUPERVISOR ______________________________

D. DURATION: From __/__/__/ To __/__/__/

E. NUMBER OF DAYS __________
10-11-12

F. HOURS PER WEEK __________
13-14

G. WORK TITLE ______________________________
15-16

H. WORK DESCRIPTION ______________________________________
17-18-19

____

____

____

I. ENROLLEE WORKED (please check) By himself ___ (1) With one or two fellow workers ___ (2) With three to ten follow workers ___ (3) With more than ten fellow workers ___ (4)
20

Note: This information is being obtained as part of a research study conducted by The George Washington University under a contract with the Department of Labor and the information will be kept confidential

418

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

II. JOB REQUIREMENTS AND ENROLLEE ABILITY

(Please rate the various requirements of the job itself by placing a check mark in the spaces provided to the left of the following descriptions. Then rate the enrollee's ability at the end of this assignment in the spaces provided to the right of the descriptions)

A. READING SKILLS (please check highest level)
21-22

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Read signs	(1) ___
(2) ___	Read single sentence instructions	(2) ___
(3) ___	Read instructions, one page or less	(3) ___
(4) ___	Read pamphlets, instruction manuals	(4) ___
(5) ___	Read wide variety of written materials	(5) ___
(0) ___	No reading skills	(0) ___

B. MATEMATICAL SKILLS (please check highest level)
23-24

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Counting	(1) ___
(2) ___	Make change	(2) ___
(3) ___	Perform addition and subtration of whole numbers	(3) ___
(4) ___	Perform multiplication and division of whole numbers	(4) ___
(5) ___	Perform calculations involving fractions, decimals and percentages	(5) ___
(0) ___	No mathematical skills	(0) ___

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

C. WRITING SKILLS (please check highest level)
25-26

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Write short lists of objects	(1) ___
(2) ___	Prepare order forms	(2) ___
(3) ___	Write one or two sentence instructions	(3) ___
(4) ___	Write short reports of activities	(4) ___
(5) ___	Write short letters and reports using acceptable grammar	(5) ___
(6) ___	Correctly compose two and three-page letters and reports	(6) ___
(0) ___	No writing skills	(0) ___

D. SPEECH SKILLS (please check highest level)
27-28

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Transmit an instruction	(1) ___
(2) ___	Communicate about work with co-workers	(2) ___
(3) ___	Communicate in standard English to general public (Visitor inquiries, phone calls, etc.)	(3) ___
(4) ___	Explain complex work operations to co-workers or to general public	(4) ___
(0) ___	No speech skills	(0) ___

E. RESPONSIBILITY (please check highest level)
29-30

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Follow simple, explicit instructions	(1) ___
(2) ___	Follow two or three-step explicit instructions	(2) ___
(3) ___	Follow general instructions, exercising common-sense Judgement	(3) ___
(4) ___	Apply clear-cut policies to different situations	(4) ___
(5) ___	Apply general policies to wide varieties of situations	(5) ___

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

F. TOOL SKILLS (please check highest level)
31-32

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Ability to use hand tools Which? ________________	(1) ___
(2) ___	Ability to perform limited operations with machines Which? ________________	(2) ___
(3) ___	Mastery of a specialized piece of equipment Which? ________________	(3) ___
(0) ___	No special tool skills	(0) ___

G. SUPERVISORY SKILLS (check highest level)
33-34

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Ability to give occasional instructions to other employees	(1) ___
(2) ___	Ability to direct the work of other employees for short periods of time	(2) ___
(3) ___	Ability to supervise a work group	(3) ___
(0) ___	No special supervisory skills	(0) ___

H. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS (check highest level)
35-36

Required for Job		Enrollee's Ability
(1) ___	Works best by himself	(1) ___
(2) ___	Works without serious conflict with others in work group	(2) ___
(3) ___	Is able to smooth out difficulties among fellow-workers	(3) ___
(4) ___	If turned to as a source of help and advice by fellow-workers	(4) ___

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

III. ENROLLEE'S CHARACTERISTICS

PLEASE RATE ENROLLEE (circle appropriate number)

A. PUNCTUALITY. 37	Never on time 1	2	3	4	Never late 5
B. ATTENDANCE 38	Very Unsatisfactory 1	2	3	4	Perfect 5
C. INITIATIVE 39	None 1	2	3	4	Exceptional 5
D. DEPENDABILITY 40	Needs constant supervision 1	2	3	4	Highly Reliable 5
E. WORK HABITS 41	Disorganized 1	2	3	4	Efficient 5
F. SPEED OF LEARNING 42	Very Slow 1	2	3	4	Very Quick 5
G. QUALITY OF WORK (accuracy, neatness, thoroughness) 43	Very Inferior 1	2	3	4	Outstanding 5
H. QUANTITY OF WORK (volume, speed, amount) 44	Very Unsatisfactory 1	2	3	4	Highly Productive 5
I. DEGREE LIKED BY OTHER EMPLOYEES 45	Disliked 1	2	3	4	Well-liked 5
J. ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY 46	Hostile 1	2	3	4	Cooperative 5
K. APPEARANCE 47	Sloppy 1	2	3	4	Neat 5
L. INTEREST IN FELLOW-WORKERS 48	Withdrawn 1	2	3	4	Very Interested 5

ID __ __ __ __ __

M. **PLEASE RATE YOUTH'S OVER-ALL PERFORMANCE IN THIS WORK** Entirely unsat-
49
isfactory and unpromising ___ (1) Unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement ___ (2) About average ___ (3) Average to good ___ (4) Outstanding ___ (5)

IV. COMMENTS

____
Work Supervisor

____
Date

APPENDIX C

Counselor Report Form
(SRG/NYC 03)

3 pages

B.O.B. No. 44-6628
Exp. 7/30/67

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University

Enrollee Work Experience
SRG/NYC 03 Page 1

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

I. WORK ASSIGNMENT

A. NAME (print) ______________________________
(last) (first) (middle/maiden)

B. WORK STATION ______________________________ 8-9
(name)

C. SUPERVISOR ______________________________
(name)

D. DURATION From _____/_____/_____/ To _____/_____/_____/

E. TYPE OF WORK (please check) 10-11 Clerical Aide ___ (1) Education Aide ___ (2) Custodial Aide ___ (3) Maintenance Aide ___ (4) Conservation or Beautification Aide ___ (5) Food Service Aide ___ (6) Health Service Aide ___ (7) Aide to Craftsmen, Mechanics or related persons ___ (8) Library Aide ___ (9) Recreation Aide ___ (10) Other (specify) ______________________________ (11)

F. NYC ASSIGNMENT NUMBER 12 First Assingment ___ (1) Second ___ (2) Third ___ (3) Fourth ___ (4) Fifth ___ (5) Sixth ___ (6) Seventh or more (number ___ (7)

G. NUMBER OF ENROLLEES ASSIGNED TO WORK STATION _____ 13-14

Note: This information is being obtained as part of a research study conducted by The George Washington University under a contract with the Department of Labor and the information will be kept confidential.

SRG/NYC 03 page 2

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

II. COUNSELOR'S RATINGS

A. SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR (please rate by circling appropriate number)

DISCIPLINE:
15
Lax ... Firm
1 2 3 4 5

RELATIONSHIP WITH ENROLLEE :
16
Impersonal ... Considerate
1 2 3 4 5

ATTITUDE TOWARD ENROLLEE:
17
Hostile ... Helpful
1 2 3 4 5

ATTENTION PAID TO TRAINING :
18
None ... Great
1 2 3 4 5

B. WORK STATION (please rate by circling appropriate number)

TOWARDS ENROLLEE, OTHER EMPLOYEES WERE, ON THE WHOLE:
19
Hostile ... Helpful
1 2 3 4 5

COOPERATION AND SUPPORT OF NYC PROGRAM BY WORK STATION MANAGERS
20
None ... Complete
1 2 3 4 5

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

III. COUNSELOR'S CONTACTS

A. How many times did you discuss the performance of this enrollee with
21
the supervisor who rate him? _____

B. How many times did you discuss the work assignment with the
22
enrollee? _____

C. Over what period of time have you had official contact with this
23
supervisor? _____

IV. COUNSELOR'S EVALUATION

A. What gains did enrollee make in preparation for employment? ________________
24-25
____

____

B. Were there detrimental aspects of work experience? Yes ___ No ___
26-27
If yes, please describe ____

____

____

____
Work Advisor or Counselor

____
(date)

APPENDIX D

Termination Form
(SRG/NYC 04)

5 pages

B,O.B. No. 44-6628
Exp. 7/30/67

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group	Enrollee Termination Form
The George Washington University	SRG/NYC 04 Page 1

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
3 4 5 6 7

I. TERMINATION RECORD

A. NAME (print) ____
(last) (first) (middle-maiden)

B. *TERMINATION DATE __/__/__/

C. ENROLLMENT DATE __/__/__/

D. TOTAL DAYS IN PROGRAM ___ ___ ___
8 9 10

E. *TOTAL DAYS ACTUALLY WORKED ___ ___ ___
11 12 13

F. *CONDITIONS AT TIME OF TERMINATION (please check all applicable conditions and circle the one most important condition)

Other employment or scheduled to report to work 14 ___
Enter Armed Forces 15 ___
Full time school 16 ___
Enter MDTA Program, Insti 17 ___
Enter OJT or apprentice 18 ___
Enter Job Corps 19 ___
Enter other training program 20 ___
Expiration of agreement 21 ___
Completed Standard Term of eligibility (C.S only) 22 ___
Moved from area 23 ___
Became ineligible - age 24 ___
Became ineligible - income 25 ___

Insufficient earnings 26 ___
Illness of enrollee 27 ___
Care for family 28 ___
Marriage or pregnancy 29 ___
Poor hours, transp. or loca. 30 ___
Poor attendance 31 ___
Misconduct 32 ___
Couldn't adjust to work 33 ___
Disliked staff 34 ___
Committed to institution 35 ___
Deceased 36 ___
Disliked job content 37 ___
Unknown 38 ___

Other (specify ____
(39)

G. NATURE OF TERMINATION Planned exit into further training or world of work. ___ (1) Planned exit, for administrative reasons ___ (2) Premature separation, NYC initiative ___ (3) Premature separation, enrollee initiative ___ (4) Other (specify) ______________________________ (5)

* Information for items available on standard NYC Termination Form

Note: This information is being obtained as part of a research study conducted by The George Washington University under a contract with the Department of Labor and the information will be kept confidential.

SEG/NYC 04 p 2

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

II. NYC EXPERIENCE

A. ASSIGNED STAFF COUNSELORS
49

(1) ____________________

(2) ____________________

(3) ____________________

(4) ____________________

B. WORK STATIONS
50

Location	Job Title	From	To
(1)			
(2)			
(3)			
(4)			

C. REMEDIAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
51

Location	Content	Hours
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
(5)		
(6)		
(7)		
(8)		

TOTAL HOURS ____________
52 - 54

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

D. COUNSELING PROVIDED

Source	Total Hours	
Employment Service		55-56
NYC		57-58
Other ______		59-60
Total		61-63

E. FURTHER COUNSELING REQUIRED AS INDICATED ON TERMINATION RECORD:
64

F. MEDICAL EXAMINATION PROVIDED
65

Examination as part of enrollment procedure ___ (1)
Examination in connection with work assignment ___ (2)
Other (specify) ______________________
______________________ (3)
No medical examination ___ (4)

G. DENTAL EXAMINATION PROVIDED
66

Examination as part of enrollment procedure ___ (1)
Examination in connection with work assignment ___ (2)
Other (specify) ______________________
______________________ (3)
No dental examination ___ (4)

H. REFERRAL PROVIDED Medical ___ (1) Dental ___ (2) No referral provided ___ (3)
67

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

G. MEDICAL EXAMINATION PROVIDED Examination as part of enrollment procedure ___ (1) Examination in connection with work assignment ___ (2)
71
Other (specify) ______________________ (3)
No medical examination ___ (4)

H. DENTAL EXAMINATION PROVIDED Examination as part of enrollment procedure ___ (1) Examination in connection with work assignment ___ (2)
72
Other (specify) ______________________ (3)
No dental examination ___ (4)

I. TREATMENT PROVIDED Medical ___ (1) Dental ___ (2) No treatment provided ___ (3)
73

III. COUNSELOR'S RATINGS

A. OVERALL IMPROVEMENT IN EMPLOYABILITY (circle appropriate number)
8

None				Great	Unable to rate
1	2	3	4	5	0

B. RATE IMPROVEMENT IN ENROLLEE'S PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT DURING NYC EXPERIENCE (check as many of the following areas in which improvement was noted. Then go back and circle the check for areas in which there was the most marked improvement)

Appearance ___ 9
Speech ___ 10
Approach ___ 11
Reading Skills ___ 12
Arithmetic skills ___ 13
Writing skills ___ 14
Speech skills ___ 15
Responsibility ___ 16
Tool skills ___ 17
Interpersonal skls. ___ 18
Supervisory skills ___ 19
Other (specify) ______________ 20

IV. FOLLOW-UP

A. DOES ENROLLEE PLAN TO RETURN TO SCHOOL? Yes ___ (1) No ___ (2)
21

B. DOES ENROLLEE PLAN TO ENROLL IN FORMAL TRAINING PROGRAM? Yes ___ (1) No ___ (2)
22

C. DOES ENROLLEE PLAN TO TAKE A JOB? [✓ Yes] ✓ (1) No ___ (2)
23

SRG/NYC 04 5

ID ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

IF ENROLLEE IS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL, ENROLL IN A FORMAL TRAINING PROGRAM, OR TAKE A JOB

State Farm Mutual

(name of school or employer) (supervisor)

(address) (telephone number)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Work Advisor or Counselor

Date

APPENDIX E

Interview Form
(SRG/NYC 22)

19 pages

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University

Prospective Follow-Up Interview
SRG/NYC 22

ID#	2	2	___	___	___	___	___
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I'm an interviewer for The George Washington University in Washington, D.C. We are doing a study in several cities of young people and their employment problems. For this study, we have been interviewing a lot of people, some who have been in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and some who have not. We hope you will help us by telling us what you think. Our conversation will be kept confidential, of course.

(Time interview began ___:___ a.m.
___:___ p.m.)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

Let's begin with a little information about you.

1-7-

8,9- 1. When were you born? ____/____/____/
mo da yr

2. How many years have you lived in this neighborhood? __________

10,11- 3. (IF LESS THAN ONE YEAR) How many months? __________

12- 4. How many years have you lived in this city? __________
(IF MORE THAN 10 YEARS, SKIP TO QUESTION 8)

13,14- 5. (IF LESS THAN ONE YEAR) How many months? __________

15,16- 6. Where did you live before that? ______________________________
(city) (state)

17- 7. How big a place was that? (READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. PROBE TO DETERMINE WHICH ONE APPLIES. CIRCLE ONE.)

1 In a large city (100,000 or more)
2 In the suburb of a large city
3 In a small city (under 100,000)
4 In a town (10,000 or under)
5 In the country, but not on a farm
6 On a farm
7 Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________________

18- 8. Please think back to the time before you were 16 years old, when you were growing up. During most of that time, before you were 16, did you live with both your father and your mother?

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO") Please tell me with whom you did live:

____

19- 9. What kind of work was (PERSON NAMED) doing most of that time? (DESCRIBE)

____

20,21- 10. What was the highest school grade that (PERSON NAMED) completed? ________
(grade)

11. Before you were 16, did your family ever receive welfare benefits, not counting Social Security or unemployment or strike benefits? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
5 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 13)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

22- 12. About how much of the time did they receive welfare--all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or only once or twice? (CIRCLE)

1 All of the time
2 Most of the time
3 Some of the time
4 Once or twice

23- 13. Are you married now or were you ever married? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
5 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 16)

14. Are you living with your husband (wife) now or are you separated, divorced or widowed? (CIRCLE)

1 Married, living with husband or wife
2 Separated
3 Divorced
4 Widowed

24,25- 15. When did you get married? ____/____/
mo yr

26- 16. With whom do you live now, that is, who are the adults in your household? Give me their relationship to you, not their names. (CIRCLE)

1 Both parents
2 Father only
3 Mother only
4 Husband or wife only
5 Live alone
6 Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________________

27- 17. Have you had any children? (CIRCLE)

a. Yes (IF "YES") How many? __________
b. No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 19)

28- 18. What are the dates of their births? ___/___/___/ ___/___/___/ ___/___/___/
mo da yr mo da yr mo da yr

29- 19. Do you live in public housing? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

For Office
Use Only

DECK 1

20. Where does the money that you live on now come from? Does money for your food, living place, clothes and other expenses come from . . . (HAND CARD 1. READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. CIRCLE LETTERS OF ALL THAT APPLY.. PROBE FOR ALL SOURCES OF INCOME.)

30A- A. Earnings of father and/or mother

31B- B. Welfare payments to father and/or mother

32C- C. Other income of father and/or mother (DESCRIBE) ____________

33D- D. Earnings of husband or wife

34E- E. Welfare payments to husband or wife

35F- F. Other income of husband or wife (DESCRIBE) ____________

36G- G. Your own earnings or training allowance

37H- H. Your own welfare payments

38I- I. Your own other income (DESCRIBE) ____________

39- 21. What is your major source of support? (UNDERLINE ONE ALTERNATIVE ABOVE)

(RETRIEVE CARD 1)

Now let's talk a little about your school experience . . .

40- 22. Did you ever leave school before graduating from high school?

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 24)

41- 23. Was it more than one time?

1 Yes
2 No

(CONTINUE ASKING EVERY QUESTION WHICH FOLLOWS REGARDLESS OF WHETHER RESPONDENT GRADUATED OR NOT)

42,43- 24. What was the last grade you had completed when you left school (the first time)? ________
(grade)

25. What was the name of that school and what city was it in? ____________

____

44,45- 26. What date did you leave school? ____/____/
mo yr

For Office Use Only

DECK 1 27. (HAND CARD 2) What were your reasons for leaving school? Please look at this list and tell me if any of these were your reasons for leaving. (READ CONTENTS OF CARD ALOUD. CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY. PROBE FOR ALL REASONS.)

46A- A. Some subjects were too difficult

47B- B. Wasn't learning anything in school

48C- C. Didn't get along well with teachers

49D- D. Didn't get along well with other students

50E- E. Was suspended or expelled

51F- F. Parents wanted me to leave; had to help out my family

52G- G. Was pregnant

53H- H. Would rather work than study

54I- I. Lost interest in school

55J- J. Graduated

56K- K. Wanted to enlist in the military service

57L- L. Got married and had to support my wife

58M- M. Didn't have enough money for clothes and other expenses

59N- N. Other reasons (WHAT?) ____

____

60,61- 28. What was the main reason why you left school? (UNDERLINE ONE MAIN REASON)

(RETRIEVE CARD 2)

62- 29. Have you returned to regular full-time school since the time you left school? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 32)

63,64 29a. How many months were you in full-time school? __________

65,66- 30. What were the dates? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

67,68- 31. What was the highest grade you completed after returning? __________
(grade)

For Office Use Only

DECK 1

6: 32. While you were not attending full-time school, did you take any part-time academic courses such as English, reading and/or arithmetic, etc? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 34)

70,71
72,73- 33. What was the total number of hours of class time? (PROBE FOR EXACT INFORMATION BASED ON NUMBER OF HOURS PER DAY, NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK, AND NUMBER OF WEEKS)

__________ X __________ X __________ = __________
(Hrs. per day) (Days per week) (No. of weeks) (Total hours)

78-
79-
80-

DECK 2

1-7-

8- 34. While you were not attending school full-time, did you take any vocational or training courses such as typing, shorthand, food preparation, tailoring auto body, print shop, etc.?

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 37)

9,10
11,12- 35. What was the total number of hours? (PROBE FOR EXACT INFORMATION ON NUMBER OF HOURS PER DAY, NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK, AND NUMBER OF WEEKS)

__________ X __________ X __________ = __________
(Hrs. per day) (Days per week) (No. of weeks) (Total Hours)

13- 36. What kind of work were you being trained for? __________

____

14- 37. (IF RESPONDENT HAS REPORTED NO FULL-TIME, PART-TIME OR VOCATIONAL COURSES, SKIP TO QUESTION 39). Were you taking the school courses to earn a diploma, degree or certificate? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 39)

15- 38. What kind of diploma, degree or certificate (high school, junior college)?

(DESCRIBE) __________

16- 39. Have you ever been in any branch of the military service? (CIRCLE)

17,18- a. Yes (IF "YES") When? ___/___/ To ___/___/
mo yr mo yr

19- Did you enlist or were you drafted? (CIRCLE)
1 Enlisted
2 Drafted

20- b. No (IF "NO," FOR BOYS ONLY) What is your draft classification now? ___

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

21- 40. Have you ever been in the Job Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 41)

40a. What were the dates that you were in the Job Corps? ____/____/ to ____/____
mo yr mo yr

40b. Were you away from home in a regular Job Corps Center or in a Skills Center or mini-center in this city? (CIRCLE)

22,23- 1 Regular Job Corps Center away from home
24,25- 2 Mini-center in this city

26- 40c. Did you finish the Job Corps training program? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

27- 41. Have you ever been in the Manpower Development Training Program, the MDTA? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 42)

28,29- 41a. What were the dates that you were in the MDTA? ____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

30- 41b. Did you finish the MDTA training? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

31- 42. Besides the MDTA or NYC, have you ever been in any other On-the-Job training program? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 43)

32,33- 42a. What were the dates that you were in the On-the-Job training program?
____/____/ To ____/____/
mo yr mo yr

34- 42b. Did you finish that On-the-Job training program? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

35- 43. Have you ever worked in the NYC, that is, the Neighborhood Youth Corps? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes (IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 49)
2 No

36- 44. Have you ever heard of the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 78)

37- 45. If you wanted to apply for the NYC, would you know where to go? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

3' 46. Can you tell me a little about what the NYC does and who it's for?

* *

(ON THE BASIS OF RESPONDENT'S REPLY, RATE HIS KNOWLEDGE OF THE NYC. CIRCLE)

39-

1 Knows quite a bit about it
2 Knows only a little about it
3 Is confused, unclear, or has no knowledge of the NYC

* *

47. Did you ever think about applying for the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 49)

48. Did you ever actually apply for the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No

40- 49. How did you hear about the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
2 Friends
3 Family, other relatives or family friends
4 School
5 Neighborhood Center
6 Ads or announcements--newspaper, radio, TV, bus posters
7 Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________________

50. Let me see . . . did you say that you had worked in the NYC? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 76)

41,42- 51. Are you working in the NYC now? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes
2 No (IF "NO") When did you leave the NYC? ____/____/
mo yr

43,44- 52. About how many months were you (have you been) in the NYC? ________
(number)

53. How many different times did you enroll in the NYC? ________
(PROBE TO GET NUMBER OF ENROLLMENTS) (number)

45,46- 54. What is the last kind of work you did (are doing) in the NYC? (GET AS COMPLETE A DESCRIPTION AS POSSIBLE) ______________________________

____

47- 55. Did you take part in any special NYC education or training courses in addition to the work program? (PROBE FOR EXACT INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATION OR TRAINING PROGRAM. CIRCLE)

a. Yes (IF "YES") Please describe ______________________________

____

b. No

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

Now we would like your general opinion about the Neighborhood Youth Corps, whether you liked it or disliked it, thought it was useful or not useful, and so on. (HAND CARD 3) Here is a card with the numbers 1 to 5 on it. In each opinion question, we want you to rate the NYC with a number; choosing number 1 would mean your opinion is closest to the words on the left, "Not at all," and choosing number 5 would mean your opinion is closest to the word on the right, "Very," while 2, 3, and 4 are in between. In other words, 1 is a low rating and 5 is a high rating.

Let's try the first one. I'll read the question and you can tell me how you would answer--1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

48- 56. How much did (do) you like the work you did (do) in the NYC program? (CIRCI

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

49,50- 57. Why do you say that? ____________________

____

51- 58. Would you consider that the work you were (are) doing was (is) important? (CIRCLE)

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

52,53- 59. In what way? ____________________

____

54- 60. How closely supervised were (are) you? (CIRCLE)

Not at all supervised				Very closely supervised
1	2	3	4	5

55- 61. How helpful was (is) your work supervisor? (CIRCLE)

Not at all helpful				Very helpful
1	2	3	4	5

56,57- 62. Can you give me an example? ____________________

____

For Office Use Only

DECK 2

58- 63. How friendly were (are) your fellow-workers? (CIRCLE)

Not at all friendly				Very friendly
1	2	3	4	5

59,60- 64. How often did (do) you see your NYC counselor? (CIRCLE)

1 More than once a week
2 About once a week
3 Two or three times a month
4 About once a month
5 Less than once a month
6 Not at all

65. When you met with your counselor, what did you talk about? (PROBE. CIRCLE ALL THAT ARE APPROPRIATE.)

61A- A. Work assignment

62B- B. Problems on the job

63C- C. Education

64D- D. Health

65E- E. Family or other personal problems

66F- F. Employment outside NYC

67G- G. Didn't talk about anything

68H- H. Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________________

____

Now let's go back to the ratings on the card again . . .

69- 66. How helpful was (is) your counselor? (CIRCLE)

Not at all helpful				Very helpful
1	2	3	4	5

70,71- 67. In what way? ______________________________

____

72- 68. All things considered, how useful was (is) your NYC experience as a whole? (CIRCLE)

Not at all useful				Very useful
1	2	3	4	5

78-
79-
80- (RETRIEVE CARD 3)

For Office
Use Only

DECK 3

1-7-

69. Considering all your experiences in the NYC, which of these did (do) you find useful? (HAND CARD 4. CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY AFTER READING ALTERNATIVES ALOUD TO RESPONDENT. PROBE.)

8A- A. Help in getting a job after NYC

9B- B. Help from work supervisor

10C- C. Help from counselor

11D- D. Learning to get along better with other people

12E- E. Learning to work for a boss

13F- F. Learning good work habits such as being on time, following directions

14G- G. Earning money

15H- H. Getting job skills, that is, learning how to do a certain job

16I- I. Continuing education

17J- J. Having an interesting job

18K- K. Nothing useful (SKIP TO QUESTION 71)

19L- L. Other (DESCRIBE) ____

____

20,21- 70. Which of these did (do) you think was (is) the most useful? (UNDERLINE ONE ABOVE)

(RETRIEVE CARD 4)

71. Let me see . . . Did you say that you were still in the NYC?

1 Yes (IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 74)
2 No

22- 72. Did you get a job at the same place where you worked as an NYC enrollee? (CIRCLE)

1 Yes (IF "YES") What agency was it? ______________________________

____

2 No

For Office Use only

DECK 3

(HAND CARD 5)

73. Did the NYC help you get a job in any of the ways listed on this card? (READ ALTERNATIVES ALOUD. CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY. PROBE.)

23A- A. Made an appointment for me with an employer

24B- B. Told me where I might find a job

25C- C. Told me how to look for a job

26D- D. Helped me fill out application forms

27E- E. Gave me practice in taking job qualification tests

28F- F. It was no help

29G- G. Other ways (DESCRIBE) ____________________

(RETRIEVE CARD 5)

30- 74. What did (do) you like best about your NYC experience? (DESCRIBE)

31- 75. What did (do) you dislike about your NYC experience? (DESCRIBE)

32- 76. What is it about the NYC that might make a person want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) ____________________

33- 77. What is it about the NYC that might make a person not want to get into it? (DESCRIBE) ____________________

For Office Use Only

DECK 3

78. (HAND CARD 6) Now I'd like to know about your activities, that is, :k school, etc. since a year ago January. Please use the list on this card and tell me what you were doing in the first and second halves of each month. Let's start with January, 1968--What were you doing then? (READ THE CATEGORIES ALOUD. PROBE TO DETERMINE FOR EACH HALF-MONTH PERIOD EXACTLY WHAT RESPONDENT'S STATUS WAS. WRITE NUMBER OF ACTIVITY LISTED BELOW IN APPROPRIATE HALF-MONTH SPACE. THE MAIN ACTIVITY FOR EACH HALF-MONTH SHOULD BE USED. IF TWO ACTIVITIES TOOK EQUAL TIME, WRITE IN BOTH NUMBERS.

EXAMPLE:

1	11	3 10	3 10

34,35-	1	In NYC
36,37-	2	Employed full-time
38,39-	3	Employed part-time
40,41-	4	Had job but not working due to illness, slack time, strike, etc.
42,43-	5	Not employed but looking for work
44,45-	6	Not employed but not looking for work
46,47-	7	In the Job Corps
48,49-	8	In the military service full-time
50,51-	9	In jail
52,53-	10	In school part-time
54,55-	11	In school full-time
56,57-	12	Housewife wanting work outside the home
58,59-	13	Housewife not wanting work outside the home
60,61-	14	In a job training program like MDTA, OJT
62,63-	15	Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________

64,65- 1968:

	Jan.		Feb.		Mar.		Apr.		May		June		July		Aug.		Sept.	
66-																		

67- 1969:

	Oct.		Nov.		Dec.		Jan.		Feb.		Mar.		Apr.		May		June	
68-																		

69-

78-
79-
80-

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

7-

79. And right now, you are doing what? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)

8A- A. In NYC

9B- B. Employed full-time

10C- C. Employed part-time

11D- D. Had job but not working due to illness, slack time, strike, etc.

12E- E. Not employed but looking for work

13F- F. Not employed but not looking for work

14G- G. In the Job Corps

15H- H. In the military service full-time

16I- I. In jail

17J- J. In school part-time

18K- K. In school full-time

19L- L. Housewife wanting work outside the home

20M- M. Housewife not wanting work outside the home

21N- N. In a job training program like MDTA or OJT

22O- O. Other (DESCRIBE) ____________________

(RETRIEVE CARD 6)

23- 80. (IF RESPONDENT HAS HAD NO EMPLOYMENT SINCE JANUARY 1, 1968, SKIP TO QUESTION 86)
Now let's go over the jobs you have had since January 1, 1968, which were not part of NYC. What did you do on the first one? ____________

____

24,25- 81. How long did you work? ________ (months)

(NUMBER OF JOBS SHOULD BE EQUAL TO NUMBER LISTED IN QUESTION 78 AND SHOULD BE IN THE SAME ORDER)

82. (IF MORE THAN ONE JOB) What did you do on the next job? ____________

____

DECK 4

83. How long did you work? ________ (months)

84. Any other jobs? Kind of work ____________________

Length of time worked ________ (months)

Kind of work ____________________

Length of time worked ________ (months)

Kind of work ____________________

Length of time worked ________ (months)

26- 85. This means you have held ________ (number) jobs since January 1, 1968?

(CALCULATE NUMBER OF JOBS FROM ABOVE INFORMATION AND CHECK IT WITH RESPONDENT. MAKE NECESSARY CORRECTIONS)

86. Not including NYC jobs, would you give us more detailed information about the job you have now (last job you had).

Employer ____________________ (name of firm)

Address ____________________ (number and street) (city and state)

Your supervisor ____________________ (full name)

27- 87. What kind of work do (did) you do? (DESCRIBE) ____________________

____

28,29- 88. How many hours a week did you work? ________

OR

(How many hours per day _______ and how many days per week? _______

30,31,32- 89. What was your highest rate of pay? $_____ per hour or $_____ per week

90. What date did you begin that job? ____/____/ mo yr

For Office Use Only

DECK 4 **91. Are you still employed there? (CIRCLE)**

1 Yes (IF "YES," SKIP TO QUESTION 94)
2 No

33,34- **92. What was the date the job ended?** ____/____/
mo yr

35- **93. (HAND CARD 7) Which of these was the main reason why you left that job? (READ CATEGORIES ALOUD. CIRCLE ONLY ONE REASON)**

1 The job ended
2 Was fired
3 Returned to school or entered a training program
4 Was pregnant
5 Moved
6 Was jailed
7 Was sick or in the hospital
8 Entered the military service
9 Left for other reasons (WHY?) ____________________

____

(RETRIEVE CARD 7)

36- **94. How did you hear about this job? (CIRCLE ONE MAIN SOURCE OF INFORMATION**

1 Public Employment Service
2 Private employment agency
3 Friends or relatives
4 School
5 Previous employer
6 Advertisements--newspaper, radio, TV, or bus posters
7 Neighborhood Youth Corps
8 Went to place of employment and asked about a job
9 Other (DESCRIBE ____________________________

____

37- **95. What kind of work would you really like to be doing ten years from now?**

38- ____

39- **96. Do you think your chances of getting that kind of work are: Very good, Fairly good, Not so good, or Unlikely? (CIRCLE)**

1 Very good
2 Fairly good
3 Not so good
4 Unlikely

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

40-

97. Is there anything that might hold you back from becoming a (NAMED JOB)?

____

____

____

98. Now we want to keep in touch with you and we need the names and addresses of two persons who are most likely to know where you are if you should move.

What is the name of your parent or guardian?

Name ____________________________________

Address ____________________________________
(number and street) (city and state)

What is his (her) relationship to you? ____________________

Name of another person __________________________

Address ____________________________________
(number and street) (city and state)

What is his (her) relationship to you? ____________________

99. What is your Social Security number? __ __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __

100. What is your telephone number? ________________________

101. The telphone is listed under whose name? ____________________

(IF RESPONDENT IS A MARRIED WOMAN AND HUSBAND'S NAME HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN, ASK:)

102. What is your husband's full name? ________________________

Now let me just check back through this to make sure I didn't miss anything . . . (CHECK PAGE BY PAGE TO MAKE SURE ALL QUESTIONS WERE COVERED.)

Your participation in our survey is appreciated very much and we thank you for you time and help.

(TIME INTERVIEW ENDED ____:____ a.m.

____:____ p.m.)

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

INTERVIEWER'S IMPRESSIONS

(COMPLETE THIS SECTION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER LEAVING RESPONDENT AND BEFORE INTERVIEWING ANOTHER RESPONDENT.)

APPEARANCE: (PLEASE RATE RESPONDENT BY CIRCLING APPROPRIATE NUMBER)

41-	103.	Inappropriate dress 1	2	3	4	Appropriate dress 5
42-	104.	Dirty 1	2	3	4	Clean 5
43-	105.	Unkempt 1	2	3	4	Neat 5
44-	106.	Poor posture 1	2	3	4	Good posture 5
45-	107.	Unhealthy Appearance 1	2	3	4	Healthy Appearance 5
46-	108.	Awkward 1	2	3	4	Poised 5

SPEECH: (PLEASE RATE RESPONDENT BY CIRCLING APPROPRIATE NUMBER)

47-	109.	Mumbles 1	2	3	4	Speaks clearly 5
48-	110.	Halting 1	2	3	4	Fluent 5
49-	111.	Ungrammatical 1	2	3	4	Good grammar 5
50-	112.	Heavy accent or dialect 1	2	3	4	Standard speech 5

ATTITUDE: (PLEASE RATE RESPONDENT BY CIRCLING APPROPRIATE NUMBER)

51-	113.	Hostile 1	2	3	4	Friendly 5
52-	114.	Apathetic 1	2	3	4	Interested 5
53	115.	Timid 1	2	3	4	Confident 5

For Office Use Only

DECK 4

54- **116. Sex of respondent: (CIRCLE)**

1 Male
2 Female

55- **117. Ethnic origin: (CIRCLE)**

1 Caucasian
2 Mexican-American
3 Negro
4 Puerto Rican
5 Other (SPECIFY) ________________

56- **118. Does respondent have any obvious physical defects which might impair his (her) ability to work? (CIRCLE)**

1 Yes (IF "YES," DESCRIBE) ______________________________

2 No ______________________________

57- **119. How do you rate respondent's chances of achieving his occupational goal? (CIRCLE)**

1 Very good
2 Fairly good
3 Not so good
4 Unlikely

58- **120. What are your reasons for giving this rating? (DESCRIBE)** ____________

____

____

59- **121. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS: Describe anything that occurred during the interview (interruptions, etc.) which you think may have influenced the accuracy or completeness with which the respondent answered the questions.**

60,61-

62-

63,64-

65- ______________________________
(interviewer)

____
(date)

78-
79-
80-

THIS INFORMATION IS BEING OBTAINED AS PART OF A RESEARCH STUDY CONDUTED BY THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, AND THE INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

APPENDIX F

Self-Report Form for Enrollee Follow-Up
(SRG/NYC 22A)

4 pages

APPENDIX F

SELF-REPORT FORM SRG/NYC 22A

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University SRG/NYC 22A

1. Name____
(last) (first) (middle/maiden)

2. Are you: (CIRCLE NUMBER)

    1 Married, living with husband or wife
    2 Separated, Divorced, or widowed
    3 Never married

3. With whom do you live now, that is, who are the adults in your household? Please give their relationship to you, not their names. ____________________

____

4. If you have any children, what are the dates of their births?

____/____/____ ____/____/____ ____/____/____
mo da yr mo da yr mo da yr

5. Where does the money that you live on now -- the money for your food, living place, clothes, and other expenses -- come from? (PLEASE THINK OF ALL YOUR SOURCES OF SUPPORT AND CIRCLE ALL THE LETTERS THAT APPLY)

    A. Earnings of father and/or mother
    B. Welfare payments to father and/or mother
    C. Other income of father and/or mother
    D. Earnings of husband or wife
    E. Welfare payments to husband or wife
    F. Other income of husband or wife (DESCRIBE) ____________________
    G. Your own earnings or training allowance
    H. Your own welfare payments
    I. Your own other income (DESCRIBE) ____________________

6. Please underline your major source of support above.

7. Have you ever been in any of the following programs: (CIRCLE LETTER)

A. Job Corps -- From ____/____ to ____/____
mo yr mo yr

B. Manpower Development Training Program (MDTA) --

From ____/____ to ____/____
mo yr mo yr

C. Any other On-the-Job Training program (OJT) —

From ____/____ to ____/____
mo yr mo yr

8. Have you ever been in the Neighborhood Youth Corps? (CIRCLE NUMBER)

1 Yes (IF YES) When? From ____/____/____ to ____/____/____
mo da yr mo da yr

2 No (IF "NO", SKIP TO QUESTION 14)

9. What kind of work did you do while you were in the NYC? (DESCRIBE)

____

10. How useful was your NYC experience? (CIRCLE THE NUMBER BELOW THAT SHOWS BEST HOW YOU FEEL)

Not at all useful				Very Useful
1	2	3	4	5

11. (IF IN NYC) Considering all your experiences in the NYC, which of these did you find useful? (CIRCLE THE LETTERS IN FRONT OF ONE OR MORE ANSWERS)

A. Help in getting a job after NYC
B. Help from work supervisor
C. Help from counselor
D. Learning to get along better with other people
E. Learning to work for a boss
F. Learning good work habits such as being on time, following directions
G. Earning money
H. Getting job skills, that is, learning how to do a certain job
I. Continuing education
J. Having an interesting job
K. Nothing useful
L. Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________________

12. Which of these do you think was the most useful? (UNDERLINE ONE ABOVE)

13. Was there anything you disliked about the NYC? (DESCRIBE) ______________

____

14. What are you doing now? (CIRCLE LETTERS FOR ALL THAT APPLY)

A. In NYC
B. Employed full-time
C. Employed part-time
D. Not employed but looking for work
E. Not employed but not looking for work
F. In school part-time
G. In school full-time
H. Housewife, not working outside the home
I. In a job training program like MDTA or OJT
J. Other (DESCRIBE) ______________________________

15. How many jobs have you had since January, 1968, which were not in NYC, MDTA, or any On-the-Job Training program? (number) ______________

16. We would appreciate some information about the job you have now. If you're not working now, please provide this information about your most recent job.

A. Employer's name ______________________________

B. Employer's address ______________________________

C. Description of kind of work done ______________________

D. What date did you begin this job? ___/___/___ mo da yr

E. Average number of hours worked per week ______________

F. Average pay per hour $__________

G. If no longer employed, what date did you stop working? ___/___/___ mo da yr

17. What kind of work would you really like to be doing ten years from now?

(DESCRIBE) ______________________________

18. Do you think your chances of getting that kind of work are: (CIRCLE NUMBER)

1 Very good
2 Fairly good
3 Not so good
4 Unlikely

19. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the NYC that might be helpful to our research? ____________________

____

____

Signature ____________________ Date __/__/__

Current address ____________________
(street and number) (city and state)

APPENDIX G

Employee Work Performance Form
(SRG/NYC 22B)

2 pages

APPENDIX G

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL
NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS

Social Research Group
The George Washington University

Employee Work Performance Form
SRG/NYC 22B

I.D. # ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

For Office
Use Only

For Office Use Only	
___ ___ ___ ___	1. EMPLOYEE'S NAME ____________________ (last) (first) (middle/maiden)
___ ___ ___	2. EMPLOYER ____________________ (name) (location)
___ ___	3. WHAT DID EMPLOYEE DO? (Please describe work) ____________________ ____________________ ____________________
___ ___	4. PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT From ___/___/___/ To ___/___/___/ mo da yr mo da yr
___ ___	5. NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK ________ (hours)
___ ___ ___	6. HIGHEST HOURLY RATE OF PAY ________ (amount)
___ ___	7. IF EMPLOYEE NO LONGER WORKS FOR YOU, WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR TERMINATION? ____________________ ____________________
___	8. PLEASE RATE EMPLOYEE'S OVERALL PERFORMANCE (Circle One Number) 1 Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising 2 Unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement 3 About average 4 Average to good 5 Outstanding

Employee Work Performance Form
SRG/NYC 22B Page 2

I.D. # ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

For Office Use Only

PLEASE RATE EMPLOYEE (circle appropriate number)

___	9. PUNCTUALITY	Never on Time 1	2	3	4	Never late 5
___	10. ATTENDANCE	Very unsatisfactory 1	2	3	4	Perfect 5
___	11. ATTITUDE TOWARD WORK (diligence and interest)	Not interested 1	2	3	4	Outstanding 5
___	12. SPEED OF LEARNING	Very slow 1	2	3	4	Very quick 5
___	13. QUALITY OF WORK (accuracy, neatness, thoroughness)	Very inferior 1	2	3	4	Outstanding 5
___	14. QUANTITY OF WORK	Very unsatisfactory 1	2	3	4	Highly productive 5
___	15. RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER WORKERS	Works poorly with others 1	2	3	4	Exceptionally well-accepted 5
___	16. ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY	Hostile 1	2	3	4	Cooperative 5
___	17. APPEARANCE (appropriateness of attire, grooming)	Very unsatisfactory 1	2	3	4	Neat, well-groomed 5

___ ___ 18. COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

____
(supervisor)

Date: ___/___/___/
mo da yr

APPENDIX H

Marginals, SRG/NYC 22

60 pages

APPENDIX H

MARGINALS, INTERVIEW FORM (SRG/NYC 22)[1]

Number of Subjects Reported

The number of subjects reported varied with type of information. All types of information reflected interviewed subjects. In addition, 11 uninterviewed subjects completed self-report forms, and activity at the time of attempted interview was ascertained for 38 uninterviewed subjects.

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Interview information only:
13	51	17	188	269	Experimental Study Group
20	49	18	120	207	Control Study Group
					Interview and self-report information:
13	51	20	192	276	Experimental Study Group
20	49	20	122	211	Control Study Group
					Interview, self-report, and activity information:
16	70	20	194	300	Experimental Study Group
26	55	20	124	225	Control Study Group

Interview Item and Code by Study Group

1. When were you born?

Male White	Male Negro	Female White	Female Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
49.2	48.8	48.8	48.0	48.3	Mean year of birth
1.34	1.13	1.07	1.43	1.40	Standard Deviation
13	51	20	192	276	Number
0	0	0	1	1	1944
0	0	0	7	7	1945
1	2	0	24	27	1946
1	5	3	36	45	1947
1	12	5	47	65	1948
2	18	6	46	72	1949
8	13	6	29	56	1950
0	1	0	2	3	1951

---

[1] Interview Form is attached as Appendix E, and Self-Report Form is attached as Appendix F.

In order to save space, totals have not been repeated for each item, and code categories with zero frequencies have not been reported (for example, no subject in the Experimental group was born in 1943). Means and Standard Deviations of multiple-column quantitative codes have been included in these Marginals.

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
48.5	47.9	48.7	47.8	48.0	Mean year of birth
1.32	1.51	1.60	1.69	1.63	Standard Deviation
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	0	0	1	1	1943
0	0	0	1	1	1944
1	4	1	6	12	1945
0	5	2	25	32	1946
3	11	1	19	34	1947
6	11	4	24	45	1948
5	11	3	24	43	1949
5	6	9	17	37	1950
0	1	0	5	6	1951

2. How many years have you lived in this neighborhood?

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
8.1	6.7	5.8	6.5	6.6	Mean years in neighborhood
6.86	5.36	7.40	6.62	6.44	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
0	3	4	18	25	Less than one year
6	23	8	98	135	1-5
2	14	1	28	45	6-10
3	7	1	15	26	11-15
2	4	2	21	29	16-20
0	0	1	8	9	21, or more
					Control:
8.2	7.2	5.9	6.3	6.7	Mean years in neighborhood
7.19	6.65	6.99	6.38	6.56	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
1	6	3	18	28	Less than one year
8	18	8	51	85	1-5
5	12	4	26	47	6-10
2	6	0	12	20	11-15
3	3	2	6	14	16-20
1	4	1	7	13	21, or more

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					4. How many years have you lived in this city?
					Experimental:
14.9	16.5	17.4	17.9	17.4	Mean years in the city
5.41	4.71	6.25	5.38	5.35	Standard Deviation
13	49	17	186	265	Number
1	2	2	16	21	5 years or less
1	4	0	9	14	6-10
5	10	1	15	31	11-15
5	29	9	79	122	16-20
1	4	5	67	77	21, or more
0	2	0	2	4	Unknown
					Control:
16.5	17.9	16.8	17.6	17.5	Mean years in city
6.40	5.36	5.44	5.93	5.78	Standard Deviation
20	43	18	119	205	Number
1	2	1	10	14	5 years or less
4	3	2	7	16	6-10
1	6	2	11	20	11-15
8	19	9	52	88	16-20
6	18	4	39	67	21, or more
0	1	0	1	2	Unknown
					6. Where did you live before? (In city 10 years or less)
					Experimental:
0	2	0	3	5	Alabama
0	1	0	1	2	Arkansas
0	0	0	2	2	Florida
0	0	0	1	1	Georgia
0	0	0	1	1	Indiana
1	1	0	3	5	Kentucky
0	0	0	4	4	Mississippi
0	0	0	1	1	Missouri
1	1	1	6	9	North Carolina
0	0	0	2	2	Ohio
0	0	1	0	1	South Carolina
0	1	0	1	2	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
0	0	0	1	1	Alabama
0	0	0	2	2	Arkansas
0	0	0	1	1	Georgia
0	0	1	1	2	Kentucky
0	1	0	0	1	Mississippi
1	0	1	0	2	Missouri
3	2	1	8	14	North Carolina
1	0	0	2	3	Ohio
0	1	0	0	1	Rhode Island
0	0	0	1	1	South Carolina
0	0	0	1	1	Virginia
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
					7. How big a place was that? (In city 10 years or less)
					Experimental:
1	2	1	6	10	Large city (100,000 or more)
0	0	0	1	1	Suburb of a large city
1	0	0	6	7	Small city (under 100,000)
0	3	0	9	12	Town (10,000 or under)
0	0	0	1	1	Country, but not on a farm
0	0	1	2	3	Farm
					Control:
1	0	0	4	5	Large city (100,000 or more)
0	1	0	1	2	Suburb of a large city
0	0	0	5	5	Small city (under 100,000)
2	1	2	2	7	Town (10,000 or under)
2	2	1	5	10	Farm

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					8. Lived most of time before age 16 with:
					Experimental:
6	26	10	85	127	Both parents
2	2	1	1	6	Parent and step-parent
0	0	1	8	9	Father only
3	19	4	76	102	Mother only
0	1	1	3	5	Other related couple (grandparents, aunt and uncle, etc.)
1	2	0	11	14	Female relative (grandmother, aunt, etc.)
0	0	0	2	2	Guardian, foster mother
1	0	0	0	1	Institution
0	1	0	2	3	Unknown
					Control:
16	26	14	62	118	Both parents
0	2	1	1	4	Parent and step-parent
0	0	0	4	4	Father only
3	16	2	39	60	Mother only
0	0	0	4	4	Other related couple (grandparents, aunt and uncle, etc.)
0	1	0	0	1	Male relative (grandfather, uncle, etc.)
1	2	0	8	11	Female relative (grandmother, aunt, etc.)
0	0	0	1	1	Guardian
0	1	0	0	1	Institution
0	0	1	0	1	Friend
0	1	0	1	2	Unknown
					9. Occupation of Principal Adult
					Experimental:
0	0	0	1	1	Major professional
0	0	0	1	1	Lesser professional
1	0	0	8	9	Small proprietor, semi-professional
1	4	2	5	12	Clerical and sales
0	0	1	2	3	Technician
3	7	5	20	35	Skilled manual
2	6	2	23	33	Machine operator
1	5	0	14	20	Semi-skilled employee
3	23	4	74	104	Unskilled
1	6	3	37	47	No occupation (housewife, relief, etc.)
1	0	0	3	4	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
0	0	1	2	3	Lesser professional
1	1	0	2	4	Small proprietor, semi-professional
0	3	0	3	6	Clerical and sales
0	1	0	2	3	Technician
4	5	4	7	20	Skilled manual
4	5	5	18	32	Machine operator
3	6	2	13	24	Semi-skilled employee
6	22	4	55	87	Unskilled
2	4	2	16	24	No occupation (housewife, relief, etc.)
0	2	0	2	4	Unknown
					10. Highest school grade completed by Principal Adult.
					Experimental:
8.0	8.7	7.9	8.3	8.3	Mean highest school grade[1]
3.54	2.48	1.77	3.16	2.97	Standard Deviation
9	44	14	157	224	Number
1	1	0	15	17	None through 3
3	8	3	24	38	4-6
2	10	6	26	44	7-8
0	8	3	26	37	9
0	6	1	25	32	10
0	6	1	21	28	11
2	3	0	15	20	12
1	2	0	3	6	High school plus (business, trade, or partial college)
0	0	0	2	2	College graduate
4	7	3	31	45	Unknown
					Control:
6.7	8.2	8.9	8.1	8.1	Mean highest school grade[1]
3.74	2.63	1.98	3.18	3.04	Standard Deviation
18	42	17	95	172	Number
3	3	0	9	15	None through 3
5	6	2	21	34	4-6
5	12	6	17	40	7-8
0	8	5	8	21	9
2	5	0	15	22	10
1	2	0	11	14	11
2	6	4	10	22	12
0	0	0	4	4	High school plus (business, trade, or partial college)
2	7	1	25	35	Unknown

[1] High school plus counted as 13 grades, and college counted as 14 grades.

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					11, 12. Family receipt of welfare benefits.
					Experimental:
2	5	1	34	42	All of the time
1	5	1	19	26	Most of the time
2	5	1	19	27	Some of the time
1	2	2	6	11	Once or twice
7	34	12	106	159	Never
0	0	0	1	1	Relief, no report how often
0	0	0	3	3	Unknown
					Control:
2	6	2	18	28	All of the time
1	9	1	10	21	Most of the time
2	4	0	15	21	Some of the time
0	2	0	5	7	Once or twice
15	26	13	70	124	Never
0	2	2	2	6	Unknown
					13, 14. Marital status at time of interview.
					Experimental:
5	8	15	56	84	Married, living with spouse
1	2	2	22	27	Separated
0	0	0	1	1	Divorced
7	41	3	113	164	Single
					Control:
8	11	12	49	80	Married, living with spouse
1	5	3	12	21	Separated
0	0	0	3	3	Divorced
0	0	0	1	1	Widowed
11	33	5	57	106	Single
					15. Months married as of 7/1/69. (Married subjects)
					Experimental:
18.5	15.3	20.0	26.1	24.0	Mean months married
14.65	10.39	11.76	11.46	12.01	Standard Deviation
6	9	14	76	105	Number
1	2	2	9	14	0-6
2	2	1	2	7	7-12
1	2	4	4	11	13-18
0	0	2	12	14	19-24
0	3	2	14	19	25-30
1	0	0	15	16	31-36
1	0	3	20	24	37 months or more
0	1	3	3	7	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
17.9	16.4	28.2	28.7	25.7	Mean months married
10.55	9.12	8.63	11.53	11.77	Standard Deviation
9	16	13	63	101	Number
1	2	0	4	7	0-6
2	4	1	7	14	7-12
1	3	0	2	6	13-18
3	3	5	5	16	19-24
1	4	1	7	13	25-30
0	0	1	4	5	31-36
1	0	5	34	40	37 months or more
0	0	2	2	4	Unknown
					16. With whom do you live now?
					Experimental:
2	14	1	29	46	Both parents
1	1	1	3	6	Father only
3	17	1	47	68	Mother only
4	4	11	46	65	Spouse
1	7	1	44	53	Alone
1	2	3	7	13	Spouse and other adults (parents, inlaws, etc
1	5	1	14	21	Other relatives (grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.)
0	0	0	2	2	Friend
0	1	1	0	2	Unknown
					Control:
6	9	4	17	36	Both parents
0	2	0	1	3	Father only
3	14	0	19	36	Mother only
7	8	11	44	70	Spouse
0	5	1	23	29	Alone
1	2	1	5	9	Spouse and other adults (parents, inlaws, etc
2	7	1	9	19	Other relatives (grandparents, aunt, uncle, etc.)
1	2	2	4	9	Friend

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					17. Have you any children? Number of children.
					Experimental:
0.5	0.5	1.0	1.4	1.1	Mean number of children
0.78	0.83	0.82	1.09	1.08	Standard Deviation
13	51	19	192	275	Number
9	35	5	48	97	No children
2	10	10	61	83	One
2	5	3	57	67	Two
0	0	1	19	20	Three
0	1	0	6	7	Four
0	0	0	1	1	Five
0	0	1	0	1	Unknown
					Control:
0.4	0.5	0.9	1.5	1.1	Mean number of children
0.60	0.62	0.67	1.11	1.04	Standard Deviation
20	49	20	122	211	Number
13	27	6	23	69	No children
6	19	11	45	81	One
1	3	3	35	42	Two
0	0	0	15	15	Three
0	0	0	2	2	Four
0	0	0	1	1	Five
0	0	0	1	1	Six
					18. Number of children born after 7/1/66.
					Experimental:
1.5	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1	Mean number of children
0.58	0.54	0.36	0.82	0.77	Standard Deviation
4	16	14	144	178	Number
0	1	0	39	40	None born after 7/1/66
2	11	12	67	92	One
2	4	2	33	41	Two
0	0	0	4	4	Three
0	0	0	1	1	Four
0	0	1	0	1	Unknown (Children, no information number born after 7/1/66).
					Control:
1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	Mean number of children
0.0	0.38	0.55	0.73	0.65	Standard Deviation
7	22	14	99	142	Number
0	1	2	28	31	None born after 7/1/66
7	19	10	47	83	One
0	2	2	24	28	Two

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					19. Do you live in public housing?
					Experimental:
1	11	0	51	63	Yes
12	40	17	137	206	No
					Control:
1	14	2	28	45	Yes
18	35	16	92	161	No
1	0	0	0	1	Unknown
					20. Where does the money come from? Current sources of income.[1]
					Experimental:
1	8	1	31	41	Parents' earnings
1	3	0	7	11	Parents' welfare payments
1	3	0	6	10	Parents' other income
2	5	15	51	73	Spouse's earnings
1	0	1	4	6	Spouse's welfare payments
0	0	0	8	8	Spouse's other income
9	37	6	71	123	Own earnings or training allowance
0	2	1	39	42	Own welfare payments
1	3	0	30	34	Own other income
0	0	0	2	2	Unknown
					Control:
3	8	3	18	32	Parents' earnings
1	1	0	3	5	Parents' welfare payments
0	1	0	2	3	Parents' other income
1	2	12	48	63	Spouse's earnings
0	0	0	2	2	Spouse's welfare payments
0	0	0	3	3	Spouse's other income
16	35	8	42	101	Own earnings or training allowance
0	1	1	18	20	Own welfare payments
2	6	0	13	21	Own other income
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown

---

[1] More than one source of income could be reported.

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					21. What is your major source of support?
					Experimental:
1	5	0	19	25	Parents' earnings
0	1	0	4	5	Parents' welfare payments
0	1	0	4	5	Parents' other income
2	4	14	47	67	Spouse's earnings
1	0	1	2	4	Spouse's welfare payments
0	0	0	5	5	Spouse's other income
9	35	4	58	106	Own earnings
0	2	1	34	37	Own welfare payments
0	3	0	17	20	Own other earnings
0	0	0	2	2	Unknown
					Control:
2	6	2	15	25	Parents' earnings
1	1	0	2	4	Parents' welfare payments
0	1	0	2	3	Parents' other income
1	2	12	46	61	Spouse's earnings
0	0	0	1	1	Spouse's welfare payments
0	0	0	2	2	Spouse's other income
14	33	5	27	79	Own earnings
0	0	1	16	17	Own welfare payments
2	6	0	10	18	Own other earnings
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					22. Did you ever leave school before graduating?
					Experimental:
13	45	15	154	227	Yes
0	6	2	34	42	No
					Control:
20	39	17	99	175	Yes
0	10	1	21	32	No
					23. Was it more than one time? (Dropped out of school)
					Experimental:
1	11	1	31	44	Yes
12	34	14	123	183	No
					Control:
2	7	1	25	35	Yes
18	31	15	73	137	No
0	1	1	1	3	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					24. What was the last grade you completed when you left school (the first time)?
					Experimental:
8.3	9.6	9.1	9.9	9.7	Mean grade completed (first dropout)
0.63	1.54	1.50	1.43	1.48	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
0	0	0	2	2	Four through six
1	6	1	5	13	Seven
7	6	7	20	40	Eight
5	14	3	48	70	Nine
0	11	3	47	61	Ten
0	8	1	31	40	Eleven
0	5	2	35	42	Twelve
0	1	0	0	1	High school plus additional schooling
					Control:
8.4	9.6	9.2	9.8	9.6	Mean grade completed (first dropout)
1.87	1.80	1.47	1.44	1.62	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
1	0	0	0	1	One through three
0	2	0	1	3	4-6
5	5	3	2	15	Seven
5	5	3	23	36	Eight
4	11	4	28	47	Nine
2	10	5	30	47	Ten
3	6	2	15	26	Eleven
0	10	1	21	32	Twelve
					26. What date did you leave school? Number of months out of school as of 1/1/68.
					Experimental:
29.1	25.7	31.7	32.5	31.1	Mean months out of school
14.78	12.67	14.65	16.33	15.69	Standard Deviation
13	46	17	179	255	Number
0	1	0	1	2	Zero to 6
0	5	0	5	10	7-12
8	17	8	64	97	13-24
3	15	2	59	79	25-36
0	7	5	20	32	37-48
1	1	2	19	23	49-60
1	0	0	7	8	61-72
0	0	0	3	3	73-84
0	0	0	1	1	85 and over
0	5	0	9	14	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
28.8	29.7	25.2	34.3	31.9	Mean months out of school
26.13	21.26	15.63	22.97	22.43	Standard Deviation
20	47	17	114	198	Number
1	6	1	7	15	Zero to 6
4	9	1	14	28	7-12
7	5	9	23	44	13-24
4	7	2	22	35	25-36
1	12	2	22	37	37-48
0	6	2	12	20	49-60
0	1	0	8	9	61-72
2	1	0	2	5	73-84
1	0	0	4	5	85 and over
0	2	1	6	9	Unknown
					27. What were your reasons for leaving school?[1]
					Experimental:
3	2	0	4	9	Some subjects too difficult
2	4	0	2	8	Wasn't learning anything
3	7	0	7	17	Didn't get along with teachers
0	3	0	1	4	Didn't get along with students
2	15	0	8	25	Was suspended or expelled
3	6	3	13	25	Parents wanted me to help out at home
0	0	3	83	86	Pregnancy
6	6	4	11	27	Would rather work than study
6	17	5	37	65	Lost interest
0	6	2	34	42	Graduated
2	2	0	0	4	Enlisted in military service
0	2	0	0	2	Married, had to support my wife
5	14	2	15	36	Didn't have enough money for clothes, etc.
					Other reasons:
1	0	0	3	4	Moved
0	0	0	2	2	Health
0	0	0	2	2	School closed
0	0	0	2	2	Other family problems
0	1	0	1	2	Quit
0	1	0	1	2	Terminal education

---

[1] More than one reason could be reported.

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
1	4	2	5	12	Some subjects too difficult
1	3	2	4	10	Wasn't learning anything
6	8	2	7	23	Didn't get along with teachers
2	0	1	3	6	Didn't get along with students
4	7	0	9	20	Was suspended or expelled
3	3	4	4	14	Parents wanted me to help out at home
0	0	4	59	63	Pregnancy
8	8	2	3	21	Would rather work than study
4	13	6	15	38	Lost interest
0	10	1	21	32	Graduated
0	3	1	0	4	Enlisted in military service
0	1	0	0	1	Married, had to support my wife
2	6	0	6	14	Didn't have enough money for clothes, etc.
					Other reasons:
0	0	0	2	2	Moved
0	2	1	3	6	Health
0	0	0	1	1	School closed
1	1	0	0	2	Enter Job Corps or other training program
1	0	0	1	2	Other family problems
1	0	0	1	2	Jail
0	1	1	0	2	Unknown

28. Main reason for leaving school:

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
1	0	0	2	3	Some subjects too difficult
0	1	0	1	2	Wasn't learning anything
2	5	0	4	11	Didn't get along with teachers
0	1	0	0	1	Didn't get along with students
1	12	0	6	19	Was suspended or expelled
2	3	3	8	16	Parents wanted me to help out at home
0	0	3	83	86	Pregnancy
2	2	4	8	16	Would rather work than study
2	10	5	27	44	Lost interest
0	6	2	34	42	Graduated
0	1	0	0	1	Enlisted in military
0	2	0	0	2	Married, had to support my wife
1	7	0	10	18	Didn't have enough money for clothes, etc.
					Other reasons:
1	0	0	0	1	Moved
0	0	0	2	2	Health
0	0	0	1	1	Other family problems
1	0	0	1	2	Terminal education
0	1	0	1	2	Quit

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
0	2	1	3	6	Some subjects too difficult
1	0	0	0	1	Wasn't learning anything
3	7	1	4	15	Didn't get along with teachers
2	0	0	0	2	Didn't get along with students
3	5	0	7	15	Was suspended or expelled
2	3	4	4	13	Parents wanted me to help out at home
0	0	4	58	62	Pregnancy
4	7	1	2	14	Would rather work than study
3	8	4	9	24	Lost interest
0	10	1	21	32	Graduated
0	1	0	0	1	Married, had to support my wife
0	2	0	6	8	Didn't have enough money for clothes, etc.
					Other reasons:
0	0	0	1	1	Moved
0	2	1	3	6	Health
1	1	0	0	2	Join Job Corps or other training program
1	0	0	1	2	Other family problems
0	0	0	1	1	Quit
0	1	1	0	2	Unknown
					29. Have you returned to regular full-time school since the time you left school?
					Experimental:
0	8	1	43	52	Yes
13	43	16	144	216	No
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					Control:
3	8	2	42	55	Yes
17	41	16	78	152	No
					29a. How many months were you in full-time school? (returned to full-time school)
					Experimental:
0.0	4.5	0.0	8.2	7.5	Mean months in full-time school
0.0	3.63	0.0	6.53	6.31	Standard Deviation
0	8	1	42	51	Number
0	1	1	4	6	One or less
0	5	0	18	23	2-6
0	2	0	12	14	7-12
0	0	0	4	4	13-18
0	0	0	3	3	19-24
0	0	0	1	1	25-30
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
22.7	7.5	4.0	11.5	11.3	Mean number of months in full-time school
13.50	5.73	1.41	9.53	9.56	Standard Deviation
3	8	2	42	55	Number
0	1	0	2	3	One or less
0	4	2	9	15	2-6
1	2	0	20	23	7-12
0	0	0	4	4	13-18
1	1	0	4	6	19-24
1	0	0	1	2	31-36
0	0	0	2	2	37-41

31. What was the highest grade you completed after returning to full-time school? (returned to full-time school)

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
0.0	9.6	9.0	10.7	10.5	Mean grade completed
0.00	1.77	0.00	1.42	1.51	Standard Deviation
0	8	1	42	51	Number
0	1	0	0	1	Seven
0	2	0	2	4	Eight
0	0	1	8	9	Nine
0	2	0	8	10	Ten
0	2	0	9	11	Eleven
0	1	0	11	12	Twelve
0	0	0	4	4	High school plus additional education
0	0	0	1	1	No information, highest grade completed
					Control:
9.3	10.1	10.0	10.8	10.6	Mean grade completed
3.51	2.41	2.83	1.49	1.79	Standard Deviation
3	7	2	39	51	Number
1	0	0	0	1	Six
0	2	0	0	2	Seven
0	0	1	2	3	Eight
1	0	0	6	7	Nine
0	2	0	11	13	Ten
0	0	0	5	5	Eleven
0	2	1	9	12	Twelve
1	1	0	6	8	High school plus additional education
0	1	0	3	4	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					32. While not attending full-time school, did you take any part-time academic courses?
					Experimental:
1	20	5	63	89	Yes
12	31	12	122	177	No
0	0	0	3	3	Unknown
					Control:
4	5	1	35	45	Yes
16	44	17	84	161	No
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					33. What was the total number of hours? (took part-time academic course)
					Experimental:
480.0	122.8	250.2	254.0	227.1	Mean hours, academic courses
0.0	134.76	442.99	530.11	463.01	Standard Deviation
1	19	5	60	85	Number
0	3	2	7	12	1-33
0	7	0	15	22	34-66
0	3	2	13	18	67-100
0	3	0	8	11	101-200
0	1	0	7	8	201-400
1	2	0	4	7	401-700
0	0	0	4	4	701-1000
0	0	1	1	2	1001-2000
0	0	0	1	1	2000 and more
0	1	0	3	4	Unknown
					Control:
188.0	172.5	23.0	210.3	200.6	Mean hours, academic courses
122.38	144.28	0.0	374.60	338.16	Standard Deviation
4	4	1	35	44	Number
1	0	1	6	8	1-33
0	0	0	8	8	34-66
0	2	0	6	8	67-100
1	1	0	8	10	101-200
2	1	0	2	5	201-400
0	0	0	3	3	401-700
0	0	0	1	1	701-1000
0	0	0	1	1	2000 and more
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					34. While not attending full-time school, did you take any part-time vocational or training courses?
					Experimental:
1	9	2	41	53	Yes
12	42	15	144	213	No
0	0	0	3	3	Unknown
					Control:
3	7	3	30	43	Yes
17	42	15	89	163	No
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					35. What was the total number of hours? (took part-time vocational courses)
					Experimental:
96.0	383.6	624.0	324.6	410.2	Mean hours, vocational or training courses
0.0	***	814.59	324.43	521.14	Standard Deviation
1	7	2	40	50	Number
0	2	1	8	11	14-50
1	1	0	8	10	51-100
0	0	0	5	5	101-200
0	0	0	7	7	201-400
0	1	0	5	6	401-700
0	0	0	5	5	701-1000
0	2	1	2	5	1001-1500
0	1	0	0	1	2880
0	2	0	1	3	Unknown
					Control:
136.0	325.3	290.0	296.3	288.5	Mean hours, vocational or training courses
133.15	430.50	170.59	343.91	332.40	Standard Deviation
3	6	3	30	42	Number
1	0	0	4	5	14-50
1	1	0	7	9	51-100
0	3	1	7	11	101-200
1	1	1	5	8	201-400
0	0	1	2	3	401-700
0	0	0	4	4	701-1000
0	1	0	1	2	1001-1500
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					36. What kind of work were you being trained for? (took part-time vocational courses)
					Experimental:
0	1	1	19	21	Clerical
0	0	0	11	11	Data processing
0	2	0	2	4	Semi-professional and technician
1	3	1	3	8	Skilled manual
0	1	0	0	1	Machine operator
0	1	0	2	3	Food service
0	1	0	4	5	Unknown
					Control:
0	2	0	18	20	Clerical
0	0	0	1	1	Data processing
0	2	1	2	5	Semi-professional and technician
3	2	2	5	12	Skilled manual
0	1	0	4	5	Food service
					37. Were you taking school courses for a diploma, degree, or certificate? (Full-time school and/or part-time academic and/or part-time vocational courses)
					Experimental:
1	17	4	64	86	Yes
1	12	1	37	51	No
0	3	2	15	20	No information, some schooling after dropout
11	19	10	69	109	Not applicable, no schooling after dropout
0	0	0	3	3	Unknown
					Control:
4	13	4	44	64	Yes
2	3	2	24	31	No
1	2	0	10	14	No information, some schooling after dropout
13	31	12	42	98	Not applicable, no schooling after dropout

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					38. What kind of diploma, degree, or certificate? (taking courses for foregoing)
					Experimental:
0	3	0	3	6	High school equivalency
1	9	4	39	53	High school diploma
0	0	0	1	1	Jr. college diploma or certificate
0	0	0	1	1	College degree
0	0	0	3	3	Business diploma
0	4	0	14	18	Vocational training certificate
0	0	0	3	3	Academic and/or vocational training certificate
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
					Control:
1	2	0	1	4	High school equivalency
2	5	2	26	35	High school diploma
0	1	0	5	6	College degree
0	0	0	1	1	Business Diploma
1	4	2	10	17	Vocational training certificate
0	1	0	0	1	Academic and/or vocational training certificate
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					39. Have you ever been in any branch of the military service? (Number of months)
					Experimental:
17.8	20.1	0.0	0.0	19.3	Mean months in military service
6.85	10.24	0.0	0.0	8.86	Standard Deviation
4	7	0	0	11	Number
0	1	0	0	1	1-6 months
1	1	0	0	2	7-12
3	3	0	0	6	19-24
0	1	0	0	1	25-30
0	1	0	0	1	31-36
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
					Control:
6.7	21.4	0.0	0.0	17.8	Mean months in military service
4.04	13.51	0.0	0.0	13.43	Standard Deviation
3	9	0	0	12	Number
2	2	0	0	4	1-6 months
1	2	0	0	3	7-12
0	1	0	0	1	19-24
0	2	0	0	2	25-30
0	1	0	0	1	31-36
0	1	0	0	1	37-42

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					39a. Did you enlist or were you drafted? (Ever in the military service)
					Experimental:
4	8	0	0	12	Enlisted
					Control:
3	7	0	0	10	Enlisted
0	2	0	0	2	Drafted
					39b. If no (never in the military service), what is your draft classification now?
					Experimental:
1	11	0	0	12	1A
4	17	0	0	21	1Y
0	3	0	0	3	4F
2	3	0	0	5	Other (3A, 1F, etc.)
2	6	0	0	8	No classification
0	2	0	0	2	No information, classification
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
0	0	17	188	205	Not applicable, female
					Control:
0	9	0	0	9	1A
6	13	0	0	19	1Y
4	3	0	0	7	4F
6	9	0	0	15	Other (3A, 1F, etc.)
1	4	0	0	5	No classification
0	2	0	0	2	Unknown
0	0	18	120	138	Not applicable, female
					40. Have you ever been in the Job Corps?
					Experimental:
2	10	0	7	19	Yes
11	41	19	184	255	No
0	0	1	1	2	Unknown
					Control:
3	6	1	4	14	Yes
17	43	19	118	197	No

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					40a. How many months? (ever in Job Corps)
					Experimental:
4.5	5.9	0.0	3.3	4.7	Mean months in Job Corps
4.95	3.82	0.0	2.56	3.49	Standard Deviation
2	9	0	7	18	Number
0	0	0	1	1	Less than one
1	4	0	3	8	1-3
0	1	0	2	3	4-6
1	3	0	1	5	7-9
0	1	0	0	1	13-15
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
					Control:
6.3	6.5	6.0	10.0	7.4	Mean months in Job Corps
4.93	4.04	0.0	5.39	4.57	Standard Deviation
3	6	1	4	14	Number
1	1	0	1	3	1-3
1	2	1	0	4	4-6
0	1	0	0	1	7-9
1	2	0	2	5	10-12
0	0	0	1	1	16 or more
					40b. Did you finish the Job Corps program? (ever in Job Corps)
					Experimental:
0	2	0	1	3	Yes
2	8	0	6	16	No
					Control:
0	1	0	1	2	Yes
3	4	1	1	9	No
0	1	0	2	3	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					41. Have you ever been in the MDTA?
					Experimental:
0	5	0	24	29	Yes
13	45	19	167	244	No
0	1	1	1	3	Unknown
					Control:
0	4	1	16	21	Yes
19	43	19	106	187	No
1	2	0	0	3	Unknown
					41a. Number of months in MDTA. (ever in MDTA)
					Experimental:
0.0	3.3	0.0	4.3	4.1	Mean months in MDTA
0.0	3.86	0.0	2.19	2.44	Standard Deviation
0	4	0	22	26	Number
0	3	0	7	10	1-3
0	0	0	11	11	4-6
0	1	0	4	5	7-9
0	1	0	2	3	Unknown
					Control:
0.0	4.8	6.0	4.3	4.5	Mean months in MDTA
0.0	0.96	0.0	2.64	2.33	Standard Deviation
0	4	1	15	20	Number
0	0	0	5	5	1-3
0	4	1	9	14	4-6
0	0	0	1	1	10-12
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					41b. Did you finish the MDTA training? (ever in MDTA)
					Experimental:
0	1	0	15	16	Yes
0	3	0	5	8	No
0	1	0	3	4	Not applicable, in program at time of interview
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown
					Control:
0	2	1	9	12	Yes
0	2	0	7	9	No

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					42. Have you ever been in any other On-the-Job training program?
					Experimental:
0	7	0	24	31	Yes
12	44	19	165	240	No
1	0	1	3	5	Unknown
					Control:
2	4	1	12	19	Yes
18	44	19	110	191	No
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
					42a. Number of months in OJT. (ever in other OJT)
					Experimental:
0.0	4.2	0.0	4.1	4.1	Mean months in other OJT
0.0	2.59	0.0	7.13	6.53	Standard Deviation
0	5	0	22	27	Number
0	2	0	17	19	1-3
0	2	0	3	5	4-6
0	1	0	1	2	7-12
0	0	0	1	1	31-36
0	2	0	2	4	Unknown
					Control:
14.5	5.3	8.0	4.4	5.8	Mean months in other OJT
12.02	1.26	0.0	4.14	5.37	Standard Deviation
2	4	1	12	19	Number
0	0	0	8	8	1-3
1	3	0	2	6	4-6
0	1	1	1	3	7-12
0	0	0	1	1	13-18
1	0	0	0	1	19-24
					42b. Did you finish that OJT training program? (ever in other OJT)
					Experimental:
0	2	0	12	14	Yes
0	3	0	9	12	No
0	1	0	3	4	Not applicable, in program at time of interview
0	1	0	0	1	Unknown
					Control:
1	2	1	9	13	Yes
1	1	0	3	5	No
0	1	0	0	1	Not applicable, in program at time of interview

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					CONTROL SUBJECTS ONLY, QUESTIONS 44-48
					44. Have you ever heard of the NYC?
12	45	17	109	183	Yes
6	1	0	5	12	No
2	3	1	6	12	Unknown
					45. If you wanted to apply, would you know where to go? (ever heard of NYC)
6	28	4	73	111	Yes
5	17	13	36	71	No
1	0	0	0	1	Unknown
					46. Interviewer's rating of respondent's knowledge of NYC. (ever heard of NYC)
2.2	2.0	2.4	2.2	2.1	Mean rating (3-point scale)
0.72	0.72	0.80	0.72	0.73	Standard Deviation
12	45	17	109	183	Number
2	12	3	21	38	1-Knows quite a bit about it
6	22	4	50	82	2-Knows only a little about it
4	11	10	38	63	3-Is confused, unclear, or has no knowledge of the NYC
					47,48. Did you ever think about applying for the NYC? Did you ever actually apply for the NYC? (ever heard of NYC)
4	16	10	69	99	Yes, and actually applied
3	13	2	8	26	Yes, but didn't apply
5	16	5	31	57	No, never thought about applying
0	0	0	1	1	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					49. How did you hear about the NYC?
					Experimental:
1	1	2	20	24	Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
6	25	8	94	133	Friends
0	5	4	30	39	Family, other relatives or family friends
3	11	0	19	33	School
3	3	1	13	20	Neighborhood Center, Poverty agencies, social worker
0	3	2	9	14	Ads or announcements
0	2	0	3	5	Private and public sources
0	1	0	1	2	Other
					Control:
2	4	3	5	14	Public Employment Service or Youth Opportunity Center
8	21	4	57	90	Friends
2	5	4	17	28	Family, other relatives or family friends
1	9	0	13	23	School
0	2	2	5	9	Neighborhood Center, Poverty agencies, social worker
1	4	4	14	23	Ads or announcements
0	0	0	1	1	Private sources
0	1	1	1	3	Private and public sources
0	0	0	1	1	Other
6	1	0	5	12	Never heard of the NYC
0	2	0	1	3	Unknown

EXPERIMENTAL STUDY GROUP ONLY, QUESTIONS 51-75

51. Are you working in the NYC now? (Number of months out of the NYC as of July 1, 1969, with terminations in July or later counted as "1").

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
25.3	21.4	24.3	19.2	20.3	Mean months out of NYC
10.36	8.32	8.26	10.55	10.14	Standard Deviation
13	48	18	184	263	Number
0	0	0	10	10	None (enrolled in the NYC at time of interview)
1	4	1	22	28	1-6
1	1	0	24	26	7-12
1	11	5	23	40	13-18
2	12	0	37	51	19-24
4	15	8	48	75	25-30
2	4	4	13	23	31-36
2	1	0	8	11	37-42
0	3	2	7	12	Unknown

52. About how many months were you (have you been) in the NYC?

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
10.9	9.0	10.0	12.8	11.8	Mean months in NYC
10.79	8.08	8.12	9.15	9.06	Standard Deviation
13	50	18	191	272	Number
3	15	5	23	46	0-1
3	11	3	33	50	4-6
2	7	2	35	46	7-9
2	6	2	29	39	10-12
1	4	4	23	32	13-18
0	6	2	30	38	19-24
1	0	0	9	10	25-30
1	1	0	9	11	31-36
0	1	2	1	4	Unknown

53. How many different times did you enroll in the NYC?

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
1.1	1.5	1.2	1.5	1.4	Mean number of enrollments
0.28	0.83	0.56	0.70	0.71	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	185	266	Number
12	33	14	118	177	One
1	14	2	54	71	Two
0	2	1	10	13	Three
0	1	0	2	3	Four
0	1	0	1	2	Five
0	0	0	3	3	No information, NYC

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					54. What is the last kind of work you did (are doing) in the NYC?
0	0	1	0	1	No job
2	5	6	92	105	Clerical
7	16	0	18	41	Indoor maintenance
1	9	0	0	10	Outdoor maintenance
0	3	0	9	12	Food service
2	9	9	32	52	Health service
0	6	2	33	41	Professional or semi-professional aide
1	3	2	3	9	Technician, craftsman or machine operator's aide
0	0	0	5	5	No information kind of work
					55. Did you take part in any special NYC education or training courses in addition to the work program?
12	38	13	115	178	No
					Yes:
1	8	3	29	41	Unspecified education courses
0	1	0	6	7	Vocational training courses
0	1	0	3	4	Educational and training courses
0	0	0	1	1	Grooming, hygiene, etc.
0	1	0	21	22	Education, training and other courses, Co-Op
0	2	1	10	13	Yes, courses--no information on type
0	0	0	3	3	Unknown
					56. How much did you like NYC work?
2	3	0	4	9	1-Not at all
0	2	1	1	4	2
4	10	3	22	39	3
0	13	2	36	51	4
7	22	11	120	160	5-Very much
0	1	0	5	6	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					57. Reasons for Like/Dislike NYC rating.
					Negative:
2	1	0	2	5	Career value or interest
2	4	0	6	12	The work itself
0	1	1	6	8	Program conditions
0	1	1	2	4	Reiteration of negative rating
					Positive:
1	12	4	50	67	Career value or interest
8	17	6	36	117	The work itself
0	10	3	11	24	Program conditions
0	4	2	18	24	Reiteration of positive rating
0	1	0	7	8	Unknown (rating or reasons)
					58. Would you consider that the work you were (are) doing was (is) important?
2	2	1	7	12	1-Not at all
0	5	1	2	8	2
1	6	0	23	30	3
4	9	3	32	48	4
6	28	11	120	165	5-Very
0	1	1	4	6	Unknown
					59. Reasons for Importance rating of NYC work.
					Unimportant:
1	0	0	7	8	Career value or interest
2	6	2	3	13	The work itself
0	0	0	1	1	Status
					Important:
1	9	2	49	61	Career value or interest
7	26	13	97	143	The work itself
1	6	0	14	21	Status
1	0	0	5	6	Reiteration of importance
0	4	0	7	11	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					60. How closely supervised were (are) you?
1	7	1	17	26	1-Not at all supervised
3	7	6	19	35	2
5	11	3	41	60	3
1	11	1	50	63	4
3	14	6	56	79	5-Very closely supervised
0	1	0	5	6	Unknown
					61. How helpful was (is) your work supervisor?
1	4	2	12	19	1-Not at all helpful
1	3	3	8	15	2
0	7	0	16	23	3
4	8	4	36	52	4
7	27	7	112	153	5-Very helpful
0	2	1	4	7	Unknown
					62. Can you give me an example?
					Unhelpful:
0	2	0	4	6	Performance standards and skills
0	0	0	1	1	Tight supervision
1	4	2	11	18	Loose supervision
1	3	1	3	8	Personal
0	1	1	4	6	Reiteration
11	39	11	158	219	No negative responses
0	2	2	7	11	Unknown
					Helpful:
9	26	5	98	138	Performance standards and skills
0	5	2	13	20	Tight supervision
0	2	0	6	8	Loose supervision
1	1	1	13	16	Personal
0	2	0	5	7	Help outside work assignment
0	0	1	7	8	Help in/outside work assignment
1	3	2	14	20	Reiteration
2	11	5	24	42	No positive responses
0	1	1	3	10	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					63. How friendly were (are) your fellow-workers?
0	0	0	1	1	1-Not at all friendly
0	1	1	1	3	2
2	4	3	31	40	3
4	10	0	40	54	4
7	35	13	111	166	5-Very friendly
0	1	0	4	5	Unknown
					64. Frequency of seeing counselor.
0	22	2	78	102	More than once a week
3	9	1	39	52	About once a week
2	5	3	30	40	Two or three times a month
3	7	7	19	36	About once a month
5	4	3	16	28	Less than once a month
0	3	1	3	7	Not at all
0	1	0	3	4	Unknown
					65. Number of topics discussed with counselor.
1	2	1	4	8	None
1	18	9	52	80	One
5	11	2	54	72	Two
3	5	3	33	44	Three
3	1	1	18	23	Four
0	6	1	10	17	Five
0	4	0	12	16	Six
0	4	0	5	9	Unknown
					65a. Topics discussed with counselor.
10	27	13	116	166	Work assignment
6	28	10	114	158	Problems on the job
6	17	4	74	101	Education
1	12	0	28	41	Health
3	13	2	51	69	Family or personal problems
6	16	2	68	92	Employment outside NYC
1	2	1	7	11	Didn't talk about anything

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					66. Rating of helpfulness of counselor.
2	5	2	13	22	1-Not at all helpful
1	3	2	10	16	2
1	5	3	19	28	3
3	6	3	40	52	4
6	31	7	101	145	5-Very helpful
0	1	0	5	6	Unknown
					67. In what ways was your counselor helpful or unhelpful?
0	1	0	3	4	Helpful regarding career or personal problems
0	0	0	2	2	Helpful within the NYC
2	3	2	8	15	Accessibility
0	1	1	3	5	Personal interest or quality
1	5	1	9	16	Helpful reiterations
7	16	1	62	86	Unhelpful regarding career or personal problems
2	5	1	12	20	Unhelpful within the NYC
0	5	1	22	28	Not easily accessible
1	8	5	22	36	Personal interest or quality
0	6	4	35	45	Unhelpful reiterations
0	1	1	10	12	Unknown
					68. Rating of usefulness of NYC as whole.
3	1	1	4	9	1-Not at all useful
0	2	0	5	7	2
0	6	1	22	29	3
3	7	8	42	60	4
7	34	10	114	165	5-Very useful
0	1	0	5	6	Unknown
					69. Useful aspects of NYC experience.
4	14	6	70	94	Help in getting a job after NYC
3	21	3	48	75	Help from work supervisor
6	23	4	63	96	Help from counselor
10	29	8	105	152	Learning to get along better with people
11	26	6	74	117	Learning to work for a boss
10	31	13	125	179	Learning good work habits
13	31	11	114	169	Earning money
7	27	11	115	160	Getting job skills
2	14	3	65	84	Continuing education
6	19	7	74	106	Having an interesting job
0	3	1	3	7	Nothing useful
0	2	0	5	7	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					70. Single most useful aspect of NYC experience.
0	4	1	25	30	Help in getting a job
0	1	0	2	3	Help from work supervisor
0	4	0	4	8	Help from counselor
2	8	1	24	35	Learning to get along with other people
3	1	1	7	12	Learning to work for a boss
2	10	4	35	51	Learning good work habits
5	11	5	35	56	Earning money
1	6	6	38	51	Getting job skills
0	1	2	15	18	Continuing education
0	3	0	2	5	Nothing useful
0	2	0	5	7	Unknown
					72. Did you get a job in an NYC agency?
1	6	3	22	32	Yes
12	43	14	151	220	No
0	0	0	10	10	Not applicalbe, in NYC at time of interview
0	2	0	5	7	Unknown
					73. NYC help in getting a job.
5	17	6	70	98	Made an appointment with employer
7	18	3	42	70	Told where to find a job
5	12	1	54	72	Told how to look for a job
4	10	1	59	74	Helped fill out forms
3	17	1	57	78	Practice in taking tests
					73a. Number of ways in which NYC helped enrollee.
3	15	8	47	73	No help
2	12	6	40	60	One
3	9	1	31	44	Two
1	5	1	29	36	Three
2	4	0	13	19	Four
1	2	0	8	11	Five
1	4	1	20	27	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					74. What did you like best about the NYC?
1	2	0	4	7	Liked nothing about the NYC
3	23	5	64	95	Career
4	4	9	51	68	NYC work
4	14	2	43	63	NYC working conditions
0	3	0	8	11	Education
0	2	0	5	7	NYC counseling
1	2	1	7	11	Other
0	1	0	6	7	Unknown
					75. What did you dislike about the NYC?
5	20	7	67	99	Nothing
1	0	0	4	5	Career
1	3	3	18	25	NYC work
5	23	7	84	119	NYC working conditions
0	1	0	1	2	Education
0	2	3	5	10	NYC counseling
1	1	0	8	10	Other
0	1	0	5	6	Unknown
					76. What is there about the NYC that might make a person want to get into it?
					Experimental:
1	2	1	1	5	Nothing
4	14	8	83	109	Career, vocational value of training
1	4	4	5	14	NYC work
5	15	3	44	67	A job, way to earn money
2	7	0	18	27	Self-improvement
0	5	0	13	18	NYC environment, people
0	3	1	17	21	Earn and learn
0	1	0	7	8	Unknown
					Control:
0	0	0	4	4	Nothing
7	22	5	38	72	Career, vocational value of training
0	0	0	3	3	NYC work
1	9	4	26	40	A job, way to earn money
1	2	1	5	9	Self-improvement
1	0	0	6	7	NYC environment, people
0	4	1	3	8	Earn and learn
0	0	0	1	1	Depends upon person
10	12	7	34	63	Unknown, including never heard of NYC

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					77. What is there about the NYC that might make a person not want to get into it?
					Experimental:
4	19	6	55	84	Nothing
1	1	0	7	9	Career
1	1	2	5	9	NYC work
5	21	4	76	106	NYC as a job, money
1	3	3	17	24	NYC environment
0	3	1	13	17	Enrollee himself
0	0	0	2	2	Location
0	1	0	0	1	Aptitude test
1	2	1	13	17	Unknown
					Control:
3	14	7	24	48	Nothing
0	2	0	6	8	Career
0	3	0	0	3	NYC work
2	11	2	21	36	NYC as a job, money
2	3	0	10	15	NYC environment
2	3	0	10	15	Enrollee himself
11	13	9	49	82	Unknown, including never heard of NYC
					78. Months in various activities, 18-month period (since January, 1968).
					In the NYC
					Experimental: (ONLY)
4.2	3.1	3.5	7.1	6.0	Mean half-months in NYC
8.66	8.09	7.09	10.74	10.10	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
10	38	11	114	173	No time
0	3	0	4	7	1/2-1 month
0	2	3	7	12	2-3 months
1	5	2	13	21	4-6 months
1	0	0	13	14	7-9 months
0	0	0	16	16	10-12 months
1	1	1	11	14	13-15 months
0	0	0	8	8	16-17 months
0	2	0	2	4	All of the time

Employed Full-Time

Experimental:

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
18.9	16.7	11.1	10.5	12.1	Mean half-months employed full-time
14.25	13.33	13.26	12.76	13.22	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
3	11	7	76	97	No time
0	2	0	9	11	1/2-1 month
0	4	2	23	29	2-3 months
2	4	2	20	28	4-6 months
1	6	2	12	21	7-9 months
2	7	0	8	17	10-12 months
0	6	1	14	21	13-15 months
4	4	2	12	22	16-17 months
1	7	1	14	23	All of the time

Control:

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
23.6	21.2	12.6	14.9	17.0	Mean half-months employed full-time
14.47	12.66	12.58	13.58	13.75	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
2	5	6	34	47	No time
0	0	1	4	5	1/2-1 month
2	2	1	6	11	2-3 months
3	8	1	20	32	4-6 months
0	5	3	13	21	7-9 months
1	6	4	7	18	10-12 months
1	6	0	11	18	13-15 months
3	7	0	7	17	16-17 months
3	10	2	18	38	All of the time

Employed Part-Time

Experimental:

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
0.3	2.6	0.4	1.4	1.5	Mean half-months employed part-time
0.75	7.23	1.46	5.15	5.38	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
11	39	15	168	233	No time
2	4	1	3	10	1/2-1 month
0	2	1	5	8	2-3 months
0	3	0	5	8	4-6 months
0	1	0	0	1	7-9 months
0	0	0	4	4	10-12 months
0	0	0	2	2	13-15 months
0	1	0	0	1	16-17 months
0	1	0	1	2	All of the time

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
5.2	1.2	1.2	2.3	2.2	Mean half-months employed part-time
10.03	3.47	3.30	6.68	6.32	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
13	42	15	98	168	No time
1	0	1	4	6	1/2-1 month
2	4	0	3	9	2-3 months
0	2	2	9	13	4-6 months
1	1	0	0	2	7-9 months
2	0	0	3	5	10-12 months
0	0	0	1	1	13-15 months
1	0	0	0	1	16-17 months
0	0	0	2	2	All of the time
					Had job but not working (strike, etc.)
					Experimental:
2.3	0.3	1.2	0.5	0.6	Mean half-months job, not working
3.02	1.37	2.73	2.22	2.70	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
11	47	13	172	243	No time
1	1	1	7	10	1/2-1 month
0	2	2	2	6	2-3 months
0	1	1	5	7	4-6 months
0	0	0	2	2	7-9 months
1	0	0	0	1	13-15 months
					Control:
0.0	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.4	Mean half-months job, not working
0.0	1.57	0.0	2.70	2.19	Standard Deviation
20	49	13	120	207	Number
20	45	18	113	196	No time
0	1	0	1	2	1/2-1 month
0	2	0	3	5	2-3 months
0	1	0	1	2	4-6 months
0	0	0	1	1	7-9 months
0	0	0	1	1	10-12 months

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Not employed, looking for work.
					Experimental:
2.1	2.8	1.2	5.8	4.7	Mean half-months not working, looking for work
2.75	5.35	3.94	9.58	8.56	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	183	269	Number
6	34	15	102	157	No time
3	3	0	17	23	1/2-1 month
2	6	1	3	24	2-3 months
2	5	0	23	30	4-6 months
0	1	1	7	9	7-9 months
0	2	0	9	11	10-12 months
0	0	0	7	7	13-15 months
0	0	0	3	3	16-17 months
0	0	0	5	5	All of the time
					Control:
2.5	3.8	2.7	3.2	3.2	Mean half-months not working, looking for work
4.73	6.53	6.89	6.96	6.64	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
14	24	15	80	133	No time
1	7	0	6	14	1/2-1 month
1	9	1	15	26	2-3 months
3	7	0	9	19	4-6 months
1	0	1	5	7	7-9 months
0	1	1	1	3	10-12 months
0	0	0	1	1	13-15 months
0	0	0	2	2	16-17 months
0	1	0	1	2	All of the time
					Not employed, not looking for work.
					Experimental:
0.7	2.0	4.1	4.5	3.8	Mean half-months not working, not looking for work
2.50	5.04	9.39	9.01	8.27	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	183	269	Number
12	38	14	131	195	No time
0	3	0	4	7	1/2-1 month
0	5	0	15	20	2-3 months
1	2	0	12	15	4-6 months
0	2	0	5	7	7-9 months
0	0	2	9	11	10-12 months
0	1	1	5	7	13-15 months
0	0	0	3	3	16-17 months
0	0	0	4	4	All of the time

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
0.1	2.9	2.3	4.3	3.4	Mean half-months not working, not looking for work
0.45	7.06	6.40	8.16	7.43	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
19	39	15	84	157	No time
1	1	0	2	4	1/2-1 month
0	1	1	4	6	2-3 months
0	3	1	12	16	4-6 months
0	1	0	8	9	7-9 months
0	2	0	5	7	10-13 months
0	2	1	3	6	13-15 months
0	0	0	2	2	All of the time
					In the Job Corps.
					Experimental:
1.2	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.3	Mean half-months in Job Corps
4.44	2.66	0.0	1.28	1.84	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
12	50	17	185	264	No time
0	0	0	2	2	2-3 months
1	0	0	1	2	7-9 months
0	1	0	0	1	10-12 months
					Control:
1.5	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.4	Mean half-months in Job Corps
5.46	2.65	0.0	2.02	3.08	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
18	47	18	119	202	No time
1	1	0	0	2	2-3 months
0	1	0	0	1	7-9 months
1	0	0	0	1	10-12 months
0	0	0	1	1	16-17 months
					In military service, full-time. (Male subjects only)
					Experimental:
5.7	4.7			4.9	Mean half-months in military service
13.06	11.79			12.0	Standard Deviation
13	51			64	Number
10	43			53	No time
1	1			2	2-3 months
0	1			1	10-12 months
1	2			3	16-17 months
1	4			5	All of the time

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
1.1	1.3			1.2	Mean half-months in military service
4.70	4.62			4.61	Standard Deviation
20	49			69	Number
19	44			63	No time
0	1			1	1/2-1 month
0	2			2	4-6 months
0	1			1	7-9 months
1	0			1	10-12 months
0	1			1	13-15 months
					In jail.
					Experimental:
0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	Mean half-months in jail
0.0	5.69	0.0	0.0	2.56	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
13	43	17	188	261	No time
0	3	0	0	3	1/2-1 month
0	1	0	0	1	2-3 months
0	1	0	0	1	4-6 months
0	1	0	0	1	7-9 months
0	1	0	0	1	10-12 months
0	1	0	0	1	13-15 months
					Control:
1.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	Mean half-months in jail
4.60	5.22	0.0	0.0	2.95	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
18	46	18	120	202	No time
1	0	0	0	1	4-6 months
0	1	0	0	1	7-9 months
1	1	0	0	2	10-12 months
0	1	0	0	1	13-15 months
					In school, part-time.
					Experimental:
0.0	0.4	1.1	1.3	1.1	Mean half-months in school part-time
0.0	2.06	4.37	5.73	5.00	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
13	49	16	173	251	No time
0	0	0	1	1	1/2-1 month
0	0	0	5	5	2-3 months
0	2	0	1	3	4-6 months
0	0	1	1	2	7-9 months
0	0	0	2	2	10-12 months
0	0	0	2	2	13-15 months
0	0	0	1	1	16-17 months
0	0	0	2	2	All of the time

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
1.8	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.7	Mean half-months in school part-time
6.77	1.57	0.94	4.36	4.01	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
18	48	17	111	194	No time
0	0	0	2	2	1/2-1 month
1	0	1	5	7	2-3 months
0	1	0	0	1	4-6 months
1	0	0	1	2	13-15 months
0	0	0	1	1	All of the time
					In school, full-time.
					Experimental:
0.0	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.6	Mean half-months in school full-time
0.0	1.97	0.0	3.91	3.39	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
13	49	17	177	256	No time
0	0	0	2	2	1/2-1 month
0	0	0	3	3	2-3 months
0	2	0	1	3	4-6 months
0	0	0	1	1	7-9 months
0	0	0	2	2	10-12 months
0	0	0	2	2	13-15 months
					Control:
1.6	2.5	0.6	3.0	2.5	Mean half-months in school full-time
4.97	6.74	2.15	8.03	7.14	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
18	42	16	102	178	No time
0	0	1	1	2	1/2-1 month
0	4	1	5	10	4-6 months
2	0	0	3	5	7-9 months
0	1	0	1	2	10-12 months
0	2	0	6	8	13-15 months
0	0	0	2	2	All of the time

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Housewife, wanting work outside the home. (Female subjects only)
					Experimental:
		2.4	1.2	1.3	Mean half-months housewife, wanting work
		7.03	5.52	5.65	Standard Deviation
		17	188	205	Number
		15	175	190	No time
		0	1	1	1/2-1 month
		0	2	2	2-3 months
		0	3	3	4-6 months
		1	1	2	7-9 months
		0	2	2	10-12 months
		1	1	2	13-15 months
		0	1	1	16-17 months
		0	2	2	All of the time
					Control:
		0.4	2.7	2.4	Mean half-months housewife, wanting work
		1.89	3.24	7.75	Standard Deviation
		18	120	138	Number
		17	102	119	No time
		0	2	2	1/2-1 month
		0	4	4	2-3 months
		1	1	2	4-6 months
		0	2	2	7-9 months
		0	2	2	10-12 months
		0	2	2	13-15 months
		0	2	2	16-17 months
		0	3	3	All of the time
					Housewife, not wanting work outside the home. (Female subjects only)
					Experimental:
		10.2	1.3	2.5	Mean half-months housewife, not wanting work
		14.43	6.30	7.64	Standard Deviation
		17	188	205	Number
		10	168	178	No time
		0	2	2	1/2-1 month
		0	2	2	2-3 months
		2	4	6	4-6 months
		0	5	5	7-9 months
		1	2	3	10-12 months
		1	2	3	13-15 months
		3	3	6	All of the time

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
		13.4	3.4	4.7	Mean half-months housewife, not wanting work
		14.95	8.99	10.47	Standard Deviation
		18	120	138	Number
		8	100	108	No time
		0	1	1	1/2-1 month
		0	3	3	2-3 months
		2	3	5	4-6 months
		3	4	7	7-9 months
		0	2	2	10-12 months
		0	1	1	13-15 months
		2	1	3	16-17 months
		3	5	8	All of the time
					In training program like MDTA, etc.
					Experimental:
0.0	1.0	0.0	1.3	1.1	Mean half-months in training program
0.0	3.30	0.0	5.14	4.54	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
13	44	17	169	243	No time
0	2	0	2	4	1/2-1 month
0	2	0	5	7	2-3 months
0	2	0	5	7	4-6 months
0	1	0	3	4	7-9 months
0	0	0	1	1	10-12 months
0	0	0	2	2	16-17 months
0	0	0	1	1	All of the time
					Control:
0.0	1.2	1.2	0.8	0.9	Mean half-months in training program
0.0	3.59	3.57	3.33	3.25	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
20	43	16	109	188	No time
0	0	0	2	2	1/2-1 month
0	2	0	4	6	2-3 months
0	3	2	2	7	4-6 months
0	1	0	2	3	7-9 months
0	0	0	1	1	13-15 months

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Involved in "Other" activities.
					Experimental:
0.0	0.5	1.8	1.4	1.2	Mean half-months in other activities
0.0	1.94	4.51	3.98	3.63	Standard Deviation
13	51	17	188	269	Number
13	47	14	157	231	No time
0	1	0	6	7	1/2-1 month
0	2	1	10	13	2-3 months
0	1	1	7	9	4-6 months
0	0	1	6	7	7-9 months
0	0	0	2	2	10-12 months
					Control:
0.0	0.0	1.4	1.0	0.7	Mean half-months in other activities
0.0	0.0	4.22	4.85	3.91	Standard Deviation
20	49	18	120	207	Number
20	49	16	112	197	No time
0	0	0	1	1	1/2-1 month
0	0	0	2	2	2-3 months
0	0	1	0	1	4-6 months
0	0	1	3	4	7-9 months
0	0	0	1	1	13-15 months
0	0	0	1	1	All of the time
					Other activities since January, 1968. (Subjects reporting other activities)
					Experimental:
0	0	3	23	26	On vacation
0	0	0	1	1	Out of town
0	3	0	4	7	Caring for family member
0	1	0	3	4	Unknown
					Control:
0	0	1	4	5	On vacation
0	0	0	1	1	In the hospital
0	0	0	1	1	Caring for family member
0	0	1	2	3	Unknown

79. And right now, you are doing what? (Could be involved in more than one)

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
0	0	0	10	10	In NYC
9	22	6	66	103	Employed full-time
0	1	1	11	13	Employed part-time
1	1	0	1	3	Had job but not working due to illness, etc.
1	10	2	48	62	Not employed but looking for work
0	8	1	18	27	Not employed but not looking for work
0	3	0	1	4	In Job Corps
2	18	0	0	20	In military service
2	5	0	1	8	In jail
0	0	0	6	6	In school part-time
0	0	0	3	3	In school full-time
0	0	3	8	11	Housewife wanting work outside the home
0	0	8	15	23	Housewife not wanting work outside home
0	1	0	8	9	In job training program (MDTA, etc.)
					Other
0	1	1	4	6	Ill (physical condition prevents job)
0	0	0	1	1	On vacation
					Control:
12	29	9	52	102	Employed full-time
3	1	2	5	11	Employed part-time
0	1	0	1	2	Had job but not working due to illness, etc.
4	7	2	21	34	Not employed but looking for work
0	3	1	14	18	Not employed but not looking for work
0	1	0	0	1	In Job Corps
6	2	0	0	8	In military service
6	3	0	0	9	In jail
1	0	1	1	3	In school part-time
0	1	0	3	4	In school full-time
0	0	0	13	13	Housewife wanting work outside the home
0	0	4	12	16	Housewife not wanting work outside home
0	2	0	1	3	In job training program (MDTA, etc.)
					Other
0	0	0	1	1	Ill (physical condition prevents job)
0	0	0	1	1	Care for family member

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					80. Kind of work, earliest job after January 1, 1968.
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
0	5	3	32	40	Clerical and sales
0	1	0	5	6	Data processing
0	2	1	4	7	Community worker
2	3	2	23	30	Hospital, health service
2	7	0	3	12	Skilled manual
1	3	2	5	11	Factory work
1	5	1	24	31	Food preparation and service
2	2	1	4	9	Semi-skilled
2	14	2	24	42	Unskilled
3	8	6	62	79	Not applicable, no job since Jan. 1, 1968
0	1	2	6	9	Unknown
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	1	0	1	2	Miscellaneous
1	4	4	22	31	Clerical and sales
0	0	0	2	2	Data processing
0	0	0	3	3	Community worker
0	4	2	17	23	Hospital, health service
7	7	0	2	16	Skilled manual
2	7	3	9	21	Factory work
1	2	3	17	23	Food preparation and service
3	3	1	3	10	Semi-skilled
6	17	2	15	40	Unskilled
0	2	5	27	34	Not applicable, no job since Jan. 1, 1968
0	2	0	4	6	Unknown
					81. Number of months in first job.
					Experimental:
9.2	8.5	11.4	8.1	8.5	Mean months, first job
7.55	7.02	11.55	7.18	7.48	Standard Deviation
10	42	12	123	187	Number
0	0	0	4	4	1-3 months
2	13	5	36	56	4-6 months
3	8	1	32	44	7-12 months
3	13	1	20	37	13-18 months
1	4	3	19	27	19-24 months
0	2	0	10	12	25-30 months
1	2	1	0	4	31-42 months
0	0	1	2	3	43-54 months

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
9.8	10.0	10.1	10.0	10.0	Mean months, first job
9.35	10.08	13.49	10.17	10.25	Standard Deviation
18	45	13	91	167	Number
0	2	0	2	4	1-3 months
5	11	4	20	40	4-6 months
4	13	3	25	45	7-12 months
5	5	4	22	36	13-18 months
2	5	1	9	17	19-24 months
0	6	0	5	11	25-30 months
1	1	0	2	4	31-42 months
1	1	0	4	6	43-54 months

85. Number of jobs since January, 1963.

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
1.8	2.2	1.2	1.0	1.3	Mean number of jobs
1.79	1.78	1.20	0.90	1.27	Standard Deviation
13	51	20	190	274	Number
3	8	6	62	79	None
5	12	7	87	111	One
2	11	6	32	51	Two
0	11	0	6	17	Three
1	5	0	2	8	Four
2	1	1	1	5	Five
0	1	0	0	1	Six
0	1	0	0	1	Seven
0	1	0	0	1	Eight
					Control:
3.0	2.0	1.4	1.5	1.7	Mean number of jobs
1.78	1.22	1.60	1.19	1.37	Standard Deviation
19	47	20	121	207	Number
0	2	6	27	35	None
4	16	6	42	68	One
4	16	6	34	60	Two
6	6	1	10	23	Three
3	5	0	5	13	Four
0	2	0	3	5	Five
1	0	0	0	1	Six
0	0	1	0	1	Seven
1	0	0	0	1	Eight

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					87. Kind of work in current or most recent job.
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
0	4	2	35	41	Clerical and sales
0	1	0	9	10	Data processing
0	0	1	3	4	Community worker
2	1	3	23	29	Health and health services
4	7	0	3	14	Skilled manual
1	10	2	7	20	Factory work
0	2	3	22	27	Food preparation and service
2	0	0	4	6	Semi-skilled
1	18	3	22	44	Unskilled
3	8	6	62	79	Not applicable, no job
0	0	0	2	2	Unknown
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	1	0	0	1	Miscellaneous
0	3	6	23	32	Clerical and sales
0	0	0	2	2	Data processing
0	0	0	2	2	Community worker
1	1	2	11	15	Health and health services
5	11	0	1	17	Skilled manual
1	3	2	10	16	Factory work
3	3	1	19	26	Food preparation and service
6	7	1	5	19	Semi-skilled
4	16	2	20	42	Unskilled
0	2	6	27	35	Not applicable, no job
0	2	0	2	4	Unknown
					88. Hours worked per week, most recent job.
					Experimental:
45.4	40.7	39.0	39.3	40.0	Mean hours per week
13.91	6.60	9.27	6.93	7.61	Standard Deviation
10	42	14	124	190	Number
0	1	1	3	5	10-20 hours
0	1	1	13	15	21-30 hours
7	31	9	90	137	31-40 hours
2	7	2	14	25	41-50 hours
0	2	1	2	5	51-60 hours
0	0	0	2	2	61-70 hours
1	0	0	0	1	71-84 hours

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
42.6	41.6	38.0	38.8	39.9	Mean hours per week
10.90	6.59	12.02	7.22	8.15	Standard Deviation
20	44	14	88	166	Number
1	1	1	5	8	10-20 hours
1	0	2	3	6	21-30 hours
10	33	8	70	121	31-40 hours
5	9	2	8	24	41-50 hours
2	0	1	2	5	51-60 hours
0	1	0	0	1	61-70 hours
1	0	0	0	1	71-84 hours

89. Average hourly earnings (current) most recent job.

Male White	Male Negro	Female White	Female Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
1	0	1	3	5	$.60-$.99
0	2	3	24	29	$1.00-$1.39
2	10	4	47	63	$1.40-$1.74
2	7	3	29	41	$1.75-$1.99
2	11	2	14	29	$2.00-$2.49
3	10	1	4	18	$2.50-$2.99
0	1	0	2	3	$3.00-$3.49
0	1	0	1	2	$3.50-$3.99
3	8	6	62	79	Not applicable, no job
0	1	0	6	7	Unknown
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	0	0	5	5	$.60-$.99
2	4	4	13	23	$1.00-$1.39
7	7	4	31	49	$1.40-$1.74
5	10	3	18	36	$1.75-$1.99
1	8	2	17	28	$2.00-$2.49
4	8	0	6	18	$2.50-$2.99
1	3	0	0	4	$3.00-$3.49
0	3	0	0	3	$3.50-$3.99
0	1	0	0	1	$4.00 or more
0	2	6	27	35	Not applicable, no job
0	3	1	5	9	Unknown

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					92. Number of months in most recent job.
					Experimental:
8.7	4.8	7.0	8.8	7.8	Mean months, most recent job
8.07	6.14	10.48	8.02	7.96	Standard Deviation
10	42	13	127	192	Number
0	2	1	4	7	Two weeks or less
4	24	6	42	76	1-3 months
0	7	2	18	27	4-6 months
1	3	2	14	20	7-9 months
3	2	0	12	17	10-12 months
1	2	0	21	24	13-18 months
0	0	0	8	8	19-24 months
1	2	2	8	13	25-36 months
					Control:
5.8	8.8	7.1	9.2	8.5	Mean months in most recent job
7.54	10.10	7.23	10.95	10.09	Standard Deviation
20	44	14	89	167	Number
3	3	1	2	9	Two weeks or less
8	16	4	34	62	1-3 months
3	6	3	13	25	4-6 months
3	4	3	14	24	7-9 months
1	5	1	4	11	10-12 months
0	3	1	9	13	13-18 months
0	4	0	4	8	19-24 months
2	2	1	3	8	25-36 months
0	1	0	6	7	36 months or more
					93. Main reason left most recent job.
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
0	3	0	9	12	Job ended
0	4	0	3	7	Was fired
0	1	0	5	6	Returned to school
0	0	2	12	14	Pregnancy
0	0	0	3	3	Moved
0	2	0	0	2	Jailed
1	2	1	2	6	Sick or hospitalized
0	2	0	0	2	Entered military service
0	7	3	17	27	Other reasons
0	0	3	6	9	Unknown
12	30	11	135	188	Not applicable, still employed or never employed

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	3	1	9	13	Job Ended
3	2	0	2	7	Was fired
1	3	0	2	6	Returned to school
0	0	2	11	13	Pregnancy
1	1	0	1	3	Moved
0	0	0	3	3	Sick or hospitalized
1	2	0	0	3	Entered military service
0	6	0	10	16	Other reasons
0	2	2	4	8	Unknown
14	30	15	80	139	Not applicable, still employed or never employed

94. How did you hear about most recent jo

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
1	8	0	11	20	Public Employment Service
0	0	1	3	4	Private employment agency
4	24	3	49	80	Friends or relatives
0	0	0	1	1	School
0	2	1	8	11	Previous employer
1	2	2	16	21	Advertisements
1	2	2	23	28	Neighborhood Youth Corps
3	4	3	12	22	Went to place of employment and asked about a job
0	1	0	1	2	Other
0	0	3	6	9	Unknown
3	8	5	62	78	Not applicable, never employed
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
1	3	1	10	15	Public Employment Service
0	0	0	1	1	Private employment agency
12	29	7	43	91	Friends or relatives
1	0	0	3	4	School
1	0	0	5	6	Previous employer
1	2	2	7	12	Advertisements
0	2	1	2	5	Neighborhood Youth Corps
3	9	2	19	33	Went to place of employment and asked about a job
1	1	0	2	4	Other
0	1	2	3	6	Unknown
0	2	5	27	34	Not applicable, never employed

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					95. What would you really like to be doing ten years from now?
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
0	2	2	15	19	Out of labor force
1	15	6	54	76	Professional, semi-professional
1	4	7	72	84	Clerical
0	2	0	10	12	Data processing
0	1	2	11	14	Technician
6	14	0	3	23	Skilled manual
1	2	0	0	3	Machine operator
2	2	0	14	18	Semi-skilled
1	4	0	7	12	Unskilled and unspecific
1	1	0	1	3	General "success" goal
0	4	2	4	10	Undecided
0	0	1	1	2	No information
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	0	2	7	9	Out of labor force
3	9	6	47	65	Professional, semi-professional
2	6	4	36	48	Clerical
0	1	0	4	5	Data processing
0	0	0	1	1	Technician
11	19	2	3	35	Skilled manual
1	2	0	1	4	Machine operator
0	5	2	14	21	Semi-skilled
2	6	3	3	14	Unskilled and unspecific
0	1	0	2	3	General "success" goal
1	0	1	3	5	Undecided
0	0	0	1	1	No information
					95a. Comparison of 10-year goal with most recent job.
					Experimental:
3	4	3	22	32	Same
2	3	0	17	22	Advancement goal
4	30	5	68	107	Different
4	14	12	85	115	Unknown (No job, no goal, or no response)
					Control:
3	5	3	9	20	Same
6	2	2	10	20	Advancement goal
10	36	6	56	108	Different
1	6	8	48	63	Unknown (No job, no goal, or no response)

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					96. What are your chances of achieving that goal?
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
4	14	5	65	88	Very good
6	20	2	75	103	Fairly good
1	7	5	32	45	Not so good
2	4	5	10	21	Unlikely
0	6	3	10	19	No response or no occupational goal
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
8	18	6	39	71	Very good
7	20	8	48	83	Fairly good
2	6	2	11	21	Not so good
2	5	1	16	24	Unlikely
1	0	3	8	12	No response or no occupational goal
					97. Is there anything that might hold you back from that kind of work?
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
6	20	5	77	108	Nothing
5	15	9	79	108	Lack of education
0	1	0	3	4	Discrimination
0	0	0	11	11	Family problems
0	1	0	0	1	Military service
0	1	0	0	1	"Myself"
0	2	0	0	2	Police record
1	0	0	0	1	Inability to pass tests
0	1	0	0	1	Transportation
1	3	0	0	4	Health
0	7	6	22	35	No response or no occupational goal
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
7	21	5	55	88	Nothing
10	18	6	39	73	Lack of education
0	0	0	2	2	Discrimination
0	0	3	8	11	Family problems
0	1	0	0	1	Military service
0	1	0	3	4	"Myself"
0	3	0	0	3	Police record
2	1	0	0	3	Inability to pass tests
0	1	0	0	1	Transportation
0	2	0	2	4	Health
1	1	6	13	21	No response or no occupational goal

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					INTERVIEWERS' RATING OF RESPONDENT:
					103. Dress
					Experimental:
13	51	20	192	276	Number
0	0	0	5	5	1-Inappropriate
0	4	1	12	17	2
4	11	0	44	59	3
6	16	8	49	79	4
3	20	8	77	108	5-Appropriate
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
20	49	20	122	211	Number
0	0	1	2	3	1-Inappropriate
1	4	0	7	12	2
0	13	1	26	40	3
8	17	7	33	65	4
11	15	9	52	87	5-Appropriate
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					104. Cleanliness
					Experimental:
1	1	1	2	5	1-Dirty
1	4	0	11	16	2
3	14	3	38	58	3
3	14	5	58	80	4
5	18	8	78	109	5-Clean
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
0	0	1	1	2	1-Dirty
1	4	1	10	16	2
3	6	2	21	32	3
7	21	5	40	73	4
9	18	9	48	84	5-Clean
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					105. Neatness
					Experimental:
1	1	1	3	6	1-Unkempt
1	5	0	16	22	2
2	14	2	50	68	3
6	18	5	51	80	4
3	13	9	66	91	5-Neat
0	0	3	6	9	No response

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
0	0	1	2	3	1-Unkempt
2	4	0	13	19	2
4	9	2	29	44	3
6	23	7	30	66	4
8	13	7	46	74	5-Neat
0	0	3	2	5	No response
					106. Posture
					Experimental:
0	0	0	2	2	1-Poor posture
2	3	0	9	14	2
3	12	4	52	71	3
5	18	7	73	103	4
3	18	6	51	78	5-Good posture
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
0	1	0	0	1	1-Poor posture
1	2	1	5	9	2
3	12	4	36	55	3
10	21	6	37	74	4
6	13	6	41	66	5-Good posture
0	0	3	3	6	No response
					107. Health
					Experimental:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Unhealthy appearance
0	2	0	8	10	2
4	10	1	41	56	3
3	16	7	70	96	4
6	23	9	68	106	5-Healthy appearance
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Unhealthy appearance
1	2	1	4	8	2
1	7	5	24	37	3
7	19	6	48	80	4
11	21	6	44	82	5-Healthy appearance
0	0	2	2	4	No response

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					108. Poise
					Experimental:
0	1	0	1	2	1-Awkward
1	1	0	6	8	2
6	18	2	63	89	3
4	21	9	69	103	4
2	10	6	47	65	5-Poised
0	0	3	6	9	No response
					Control:
2	0	0	0	2	1-Awkward
1	6	0	4	11	2
4	14	6	37	61	3
7	20	11	49	87	4
4	8	1	30	43	5-Poised
2	1	2	2	7	No response
					109. Speech
					Experimental:
0	1	0	0	1	1-Mumbles
2	8	0	13	23	2
4	17	4	41	66	3
5	15	6	79	105	4
2	10	7	54	73	5-Speaks clearly
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
0	1	0	1	2	1-Mumbles
1	9	2	8	20	2
4	16	4	22	46	3
11	16	8	48	83	4
4	7	4	41	56	5-Speaks clearly
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					110. Fluency of speech
					Experimental:
0	2	0	2	4	1-Halting
1	9	0	13	23	2
8	18	6	44	76	3
2	13	6	76	97	4
2	9	5	46	62	5-Fluent
0	0	3	6	9	No response

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
2	2	0	0	4	1-Halting
1	5	2	13	21	2
4	21	4	29	58	3
9	16	9	47	81	4
4	5	3	31	43	5-Fluent
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					111. Grammar
					Experimental:
0	1	0	1	2	1-Ungrammatical
2	8	3	14	27	2
7	21	6	74	108	3
4	14	4	60	82	4
0	7	4	36	47	5-Grammatical
0	0	3	7	10	No response
					Control:
0	1	0	0	1	1-Ungrammatical
3	1	1	12	17	2
7	28	10	33	78	3
7	14	5	52	78	4
3	5	2	23	33	5-Grammatical
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					112. Accent
					Experimental:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Heavy accent
2	3	0	8	13	2
2	19	5	49	75	3
6	19	5	79	109	4
3	10	7	49	69	5-Standard speech
0	0	3	7	10	No response
					Control:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Heavy accent
0	3	3	10	16	2
4	19	5	36	64	3
6	20	7	35	68	4
10	7	3	38	58	5-Standard speech
0	0	2	3	5	No response

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					113. Attitude
					Experimental:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Hostile
0	2	1	3	6	2
0	6	0	10	16	3
4	10	2	56	72	4
9	33	14	118	174	5-Friendly
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Hostile
0	0	1	5	6	2
0	6	2	12	20	3
2	14	4	24	44	4
13	29	11	79	137	5-Friendly
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					114. Interest
					Experimental:
0	1	0	2	3	1-Apathetic
0	5	1	10	16	2
5	6	1	35	47	3
2	11	5	59	77	4
6	28	10	81	125	5-Interested
0	0	3	5	8	No response
					Control:
0	0	0	2	2	1-Apathetic
1	4	1	7	13	2
4	8	5	22	39	3
5	16	5	41	67	4
10	21	7	48	86	5-Interested
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					115. Confidence
					Experimental:
0	0	0	1	1	1-Timid
1	4	1	8	14	2
6	14	1	46	67	3
4	15	8	75	102	4
2	18	7	56	83	5-Confident
0	0	3	6	9	No response

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					Control:
0	0	0	0	0	1-Timid
1	2	1	5	9	2
5	15	4	32	56	3
7	17	8	40	72	4
7	15	5	43	70	5-Confident
0	0	2	2	4	No response
					118. Any obvious physical handicaps?
					Experimental:
8	50	17	182	257	None
0	1	0	3	4	Obese, small
2	0	0	1	3	Amputated limb or member
1	0	0	0	1	Speech defect
1	0	0	0	1	Wears glasses
1	0	0	0	1	Retarded
0	0	3	6	9	No information
					Control:
19	46	17	115	197	None
0	0	0	1	1	Obese, small
1	2	1	2	6	Amputated limb or member
0	1	0	1	2	Retarded
0	0	0	1	1	Can't lift, health
0	0	2	2	4	No information
					119. Interviewer's rating of chance of goal achievement.
					Experimental:
3	9	3	43	58	Very good
5	18	4	75	102	Fairly good
4	15	6	42	67	Not so good
1	3	1	13	18	Unlikely
0	2	4	15	21	No information
0	4	2	4	10	No occupational goal
					Control:
7	11	5	32	55	Very good
6	20	6	32	64	Fairly good
4	14	3	32	53	Not so good
2	4	1	14	21	Unlikely
0	0	3	4	7	No information
1	0	2	8	11	No occupational goal

Male		Female			
White	Negro	White	Negro	TOTAL	
					120. Interviewer's reasons for rating.
					Experimental:
0	2	1	8	11	Irrelevant
3	7	0	19	29	Has or is getting training or education
1	1	3	20	25	Has ability
2	14	3	64	83	Has motivation and interest
5	13	3	35	56	Lacks training or education
1	4	2	17	24	Lacks motivation
0	3	0	0	3	Police record interferes
1	1	1	12	15	Personal or family problems
0	2	5	13	20	No information
0	4	2	4	10	No occupational goal
					Control:
0	2	1	8	11	Irrelevant
1	11	2	15	29	Has or is getting training or education
4	1	2	9	16	Has ability
6	15	2	33	56	Has motivation and interest
2	8	6	24	40	Lacks training or education
0	1	0	0	1	Lacks ability
4	10	1	14	29	Lacks motivation
0	1	0	0	1	Police record interferes
2	0	0	8	10	Personal or family problems
0	0	4	3	7	No information
1	0	2	8	11	No occupational goal

APPENDIX I

Occupational Categories and Illustrative Jobs, Employment of Study Subjects

1 page

APPENDIX I

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES AND ILLUSTRATIVE JOBS, EMPLOYMENT OF STUDY SUBJECTS

Clerical and Sales
- Clerk--admitting, office, tool, credit, supply
- Office work--secretary, typist, stenographer, bookkeeper
- Comptometer operator, cashier, salesman

Data Processing
- Keypunch, coder

Community Worker
- Relief worker, community developer, counselor, recreation aide, teacher aide

Hospital, Health Service (NEC)
- Laboratory assistant, Diatetic worker in VA hospital, Nurse's aide

Skilled Manual (including apprentice or helper)
- Printing apprentice, welder, mechanic, draftsman, surveyor

Factory Work
- Fixing typewriters, grinding crystals, assembly work, ring polisher

Food Preparation and Service
- Waitress, busgirl, wrap sandwiches, salad girl, short order cook

Semi-Skilled (NEC)
- Hand rubdowns in health salon, theater handyman, city worker, laying carpet, taking care of horses, elevator operator

Unskilled (NEC)
- Cleaning and maintenance, material handler, dishwasher, maid; unspecified work (e.g., "construction," "labor", "warehouse," "brickyard")

Miscellaneous
- Bowler, drummer

APPENDIX J

Occupational Categories and Illustrative Work, Occupational Goals of Study Subjects

1 page

APPENDIX J

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES AND ILLUSTRATIVE WORK, OCCUPATIONAL GOALS OF STUDY SUBJECTS

Professional, Semi-Professional, Entrepreneur	Accountant, teacher, clinical psychologist, engineer, social worker, nurse, professional entertainer, librarian, artist, businessman, photographer, mortician, mathematician, designer, NYC counselor, preacher, pilot, occupational therapist
Clerical	Secretary, receptionist, office work, filing clerk, clerk typist, sales clerk, bookkeeper, bank clerk, post office clerk, cashier
Data Processing	Computer operator, keypunch
Technician	X-ray technician, lab work, surgery technician
Skilled Manual	Auto mechanic, welder, radio and TV repair, dye maker, painter, pipefitter, electrician, beautician, pressman, seamstress
Machine Operator	Truck driver
Semi-Skilled	WAC, Army, factory work, stewardess, cook, gas attendant
Unskilled and Unspecific	Maintenance, food service, domestic, "laundry," "construction," "working with children"
General Success Goal	Get an education and make money, be an executive

APPENDIX K

Case Studies

70 pages

Appendix K

Case Studies

Case studies have been incorporated in some of the reports previously issued in the course of this research, and their presentation has been organized in several ways. In one of the earliest reports,[1] cases were used to illustrate modes of program effectiveness and ineffectiveness. Various kinds employability needs and program inputs were illustrated, also, with cases developed in the study of a specialized, clerical skill training program.[2] Most recently, cases have been presented in illustration of a tentative typology that, on the basis of employability needs, discriminated four enrollee groups: the disadvantaged graduate, the adverse situation, the rebel, and the low self-esteem groups.[3] Except for Case 2, which was reported as Case 2 in the Co-Op study, the cases in this appendix have not been previously reported. In presenting these cases, however, the various factors in program effectiveness that have become apparent in the course of this research have been noted as appropriate.

The case studies ordinarily reflected information collected in three successive time periods: Initial information collected at the time of NYC enrollment in 1966-67; NYC experience information reported by the programs in the course of NYC enrollments; and Follow-Up information secured by interviews with study subjects in 1968 and in 1969, and through employers' reports of work performance.[4]

---

[1] See "A Study of Terminated Enrollees in Three Urban Out-of-School NYC Programs," Chapter VII.

[2] See "The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op: A Formal Skill Training Program," Chapter VIII.

[3] See "The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes," Appendix G.

[4] The information forms involved have been appended, as follows: Appendix A (Initial Information, SRG/NYC 01); Appendices B, C, and D (Program Information forms 02, 03, and 04); Appendix E (Follow-Up Interview form); and Appendix G (Employer's Work Performance--EWP--form). The standard NYC enrollment application form (NYC 16) was also used as a source of initial information, and enrollee self-reports (see Appendix F) were sometimes available for follow-up information.

As was true in earlier studies, many more "successes" were found among females than among males, reflecting, perhaps, the observation that females are easier to help with an NYC-type program.

It should be noted, also, that in most instances, "successes" were achieved through direct employment assistance to the enrollee such as employment at the work site or in a similar job, or referral to a skill-training program such as MDTA or WTI. This finding further reinforces the conclusion that work experience by itself has little effect unless it provides specific training for available jobs.

"Successful" Short Enrollments

The first six cases concerned enrollees whose NYC experience ranged from two-and-a-half to seven months and whose second-round interviews, with the exception of Case 6, indicated "successful" adjustments to the world of work in that they were employed at the time of interview in jobs that they had held for at least four months and which paid at least $1.50 per hour.

Case 1, a high school graduate who had taken secretarial courses in school but who had never held a job prior to her NYC experience, spent two-and-a-half months in the NYC and had been self-supporting since then. This enrollee possessed vocational skills when she enrolled, and the NYC's help in enhancing her employability consisted largely of practical experience in a clerical work assignment and counsel with respect to office behavior, appearance, and the like. Program records indicated that this enrollee terminated from the NYC in a "planned exit" to permanent employment. Enrollee reported that the NYC had been of "no help" in securing post-NYC job, so that this case illustrated minimal employability needs effectively met with fairly short but relevant work training.

It was of interest that the character of this enrollee's work station, an office of the N.A.A.C.P., conferred importance on her NYC work in the first interview; but that, in the second interview, she thought her work less important and characterized it as "flunk work." Changes in enrollees' perceptions of the NYC were often apparent in their second interviews.

Case No. 1 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When R applied for NYC enrollment in November, 1966, her age was 21 years and 10 months. She had completed high school the preceding June and had never held a job. She was single, and lived with both parents in a family of seven persons which included her own child. Her lifetime occupational goal was "Secretary."

SRG/NYC 01

R had never held a job because she "didn't look" for one. She had taken secretarial courses in high school (typing, shorthand, office math) and thought that she was able to do secretarial work "reasonably well." R considered that her secretarial occupational goal was "reasonable."

Interviewer also rated R's occupational goal as "reasonable" because of R's "preparation and possession of skills." Interviewer gave R highest rating ("5") in all impression areas, and commented:

> R is an exceptionally well-poised young lady. She should function well in a work setting.

NYC Experience

About two weeks after she had applied for NYC enrollment, R was enrolled and assigned to clerk-typist work in a one-enrollee work station (the NAACP). R was in this assignment for about two-and-a-half months, when she terminated her NYC enrollment to take a full-time job with the city.

R's supervisor rated her performance as "4" (average to good). She rated her Initiative at "2" (next to "none"), and her Attendance and Dependability at "3". In all other performance areas, R's supervisor gave high ratings of "4" or "5". R's counselor described the gains made in preparations for employment as:

> Enrollee was encouraged to use more initiative. She was also counseled about her appearance.

In addition to her work experience, R received five hours of individual NYC counseling and two hours of work station individual counseling. Counselor commented, "The NYC program helped this enrollee to establish better work habits," and that:

> Enrollee was very receptive to guidance. Emphasis was placed upon making enrollee more suitable for permanent placement in an office setting.

R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "4" with most marked improvement in Appearance, Approach and Responsibility and some improvement being noted in Speech, Tool Skills, and Interpersonal Skills.

Follow-Up Information

R was interviewed in July, 1968, and again in July, 1969. Her most recent employer, identified in the second interview, completed an EWP.

First Interview

R, a resident of the site city for most of her life, had graduated from high school in June, 1966, and had become a mother the following September. Although R and her child made their home with R's parents, R considered herself to be self-supported by her own earnings.

R reported that she had heard about the NYC from "friends" and that she had been in the NYC for three months, leaving in February, 1967. R described her work as clerk-typist, and rated her liking for the work at "3" explaining, "It was alright, people were nice, saw the public." R rated the importance of her work at "4" and provided "working for the NAACP" as a reason. R rated the closeness of supervision at "4" and the helpfulness of her supervisor at "3" commenting that she "taught her (R) about the work (and) how to write neatly." R rated her fellow-workers as "very friendly," and the helpfulness of her counselor at "4" (explained how important initiative, etc., are). All things considered, R rated the overall usefulness of her NYC experience at "4" and considered that "learning good work habits" had been the most useful aspect of her experience.

"Learning good office procedure" was what R liked best about her NYC experience, and "salary" was what she disliked. She thought a person might want to get into the NYC for "training," and that a person might not want to get into it because of "money."

R went from the NYC to a clerical job with the Board of Education. R worked at this job, which paid $2.29 per hour, for 16 months, or until July, 1968. R said that she had heard about this job through "school," and that she left the job because she was "leaving the city." R had been unemployed throughout the month of July.

Asked what kind of work she would really like to be doing in ten years, R answered "none." Interviewer gave highest ratings of "5" to R's friendliness and cleanliness. Interviewer gave ratings of "4" in all other impression areas except dress which was rated "3"

Second Interview

Family situation had not changed since first interview. R reported that she had been in the NYC two months, leaving in December, 1966. Again, rated her liking for NYC work at "3," explaining "not enough money, (but) good for the experience." She reduced her rating of the importance of NYC work to "3," because, she said:

> I did flunk stuff, could have done without the work. My work was stuff the other secretary didn't want to do.

R rate the closeness of her supervision and the helpfulness of her supervisor at "4," explaining:

> Well, taught me how to use different office machines, duplicator. Showed me how to set up and clean up machines.

R rated the friendliness of fellow-workers and the helpfulness of her counselor at "5," explaining that the counselor "talked to me about problems, looked for job outside NYC." All things considered, R rated the usefulness of her NYC experience at "3"; and, thought that, as she had in her first interview, the most useful aspect of her experience had been learning good work habits.

The two themes that R had sounded in her first interview as the good and bad aspects of the NYC--training and money--were more fully stated in her second interview. What she liked best about the NYC was:

> Experience--taught me how to work office machines, duplicator, addressograph, and general paper work.

What R disliked about her NYC experience was, "The money. Could have been more. Was not enough". A person might want to get into the NYC, R reported, because of "Experience, on-the-job training, (and) people you work with like supervisors." A person might not want to get into the NYC because, "The money was not enough for the work I was doing."

When R was interviewed the second time, she was working as a receptionist-secretary-stenographer for a hospital and earning $2.35 per hour. She had been in this job nine months, and said that she had heard about this job from a previous employer. In her 18-month activity record, R reported herself to be unemployed and looking for work in July, August, and September, 1968 (information consistent with her first interview), but also that she was unemployed in May and June, 1968 (when, on her first interview, she reported employment).

R's ten-year occupational goal was "secretarial work" and she thought her chances of achievement were "very good". Interviewer rated her chances as "not so good" because "R has an arrogant attitude about job, although she does work." At the time of the interview, R was in bed as a result of a rash. Perhaps as a result of her illness, interviewer made more use of "3" or "2" ratings in five impoession areas: Cleanliness, Fluency, Grammatical Correctness, Standard Speech, and Friendliness. Interviewer noted that the interview had been interrupted by small children, telephone calls, and a friend who came by and stopped to talk.

EWP

Employer rated R's overall performance at "4" (average to good), and reported R's rate of pay to be $2.57. The EWP was completed in April, 1970, and indicated that R still had the job reported in her second interview and had probably received a raise in pay. R received highest rating ("5") in Appearance and rating of "4" in Attitude toward Work, Quality of Work, Relationship with Other Workers, and Attitude towards Authority. R was rated "3" in remaining performance areas.

Case 2, also, had an occupational goal in the clerical field and had never held a job. Compared to Case 1, the employability needs of Case 2 were greater: she had had less education, less vocational preparation, and had been out of school longer. After four months in the NYC, Case 2 terminated to a full-time job in her chosen field. Follow-up information indicated that this enrollee had developed into an employee whose work performance was rated "outstanding." Factors in this dramatic "success" story included the enrollee's characteristics ("ambitious and realistic"), and the program resources available to her in this site--classroom work, counseling, and on-the-job work experience directly related to her vocational interest. Although it was felt that this enrollee could have benefited from longer NYC experience and her termination was described as "premature," follow-up information indicated that this enrollee achieved highly satisfactory adjustment to the world of work. Part of this post-NYC success was apparently associated with the character of her employer, a co-operating firm in this program's clerical skill-training component. This employer's interest in Case 2 was a factor in her successful employment experience. The employer's sensitivity to the aspirations of this enrollee was doubtless associated with the firm's participation in the clerical Co-Op.

The development of this enrollee from an unemployed dropout with a police record into a productive and enthusiastic worker showed what can be achieved with motivation and vocationally relevant program resources. Among the more dramatic indications of this enrollee's improvement in the NYC were her entry and termination test scores: in four months her General Clerical score rose from the 53rd percentile to the 94th percentile, and her Math grade level rose from 8.4 to 9.5. In many of the other cases, evidence of improvement in the program was less clear-cut, program resources were more limited, and successful outcomes were associated with longer enrollments.

Comparison of the various sources of information available in this case showed general consistency with respect to extent of schooling and NYC experience. It was of interest, however, that the second interview produced what appeared to be the most accurate description of school experience (drop-out in the 10th grade in 1965, and return to full-time school and completion of the 11th grade in '65-'66). This report jibed with the information that the enrollee's child had been born in August, 1965; but differed from the NYC 16 information (11 grades completed and out of school since January, 1965) and from First Interview information (11 grades completed and out of school since March, 1965). As to NYC experience, program records indicated four months and the enrollee reported three months in both interviews. Minor discrepancies between reports of "objective" data from different sources were often present in the records of the Prospective study. The pictures presented by data from different sources were usually substantially similar, as in this case, with successive reports adding to information already available.

Case No. 2 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When she applied for enrollment in the NYC in January, 1967, R's age was 18 years and 4 months. R was single, lived in public housing, in a mother-only, welfare-assisted family of six that included R's own child. R had left school 25 months earlier, after completing 11 grades, for reasons of "health." She had never hald a job, and her occupational goal was "Clerk-Typist."

SRG/NYC 01

R had taken typing in school, and felt that she could perform "adequately" as a Clerk-Typist. The main reason that she had never held a job was that she had been "attending school." R estimated her chances of achieving goal as "reasonably good."

Interviewer considered R's goal to be "reasonable" because R had "potential and motivation." R made a good impression on her initial interviewer who rated R "5" in all areas except Timid-Confident which was rated "4."

Co-Op I

R was referred to the Co-Op program and became a subject in a special study of this program, as well as a subject in the Prospective study. As a Co-Op participant, R was tested and found to have a reading grade level of 11.0 and an arithmetic grade level of 8.4. R was in the 53rd percentile in the General Clerical Test. The Co-Op Initial Interview, conducted about three weeks after R's application, reported R's typing speed as 67 WPM. Co-Op interviewer gave ratings of "4" in Mumbles-Speaks Clearly, Hostile-Friendly, and Apathetic-Interested. A low rating of "2" was given in Unkempt-Neat, and ratings of "3" were given in all other areas. Co-Op interviewer noted that R's goal to be a "Secretary" was "reasonable," because "Enrollee has very good potential, unusually good test scores," and commented, "(R) seems to be ambitious and realistic."

In the additional information collected on Co-Op subjects, R was described as having scored 108 on a Terman-McNemar test completed in 1962. According to school records, R had repeated 10th grade and had left school in March, 1965. R had a record of five police contacts going back to October, 1962. These contacts included two referrals to the Juvenile Court, and the most recent contact (December, 1965) involved arrest in connection with a stolen car.

NYC Experience

After about a month of brush-up work in the Educational Center, R was placed in her first work assignment. This lasted about a month, being followed by another period in the Educational Center, and a second period of work experience in the same co-operating firm. R took a job with this firm, after having been in the NYC a little over four months. R's termination from the NYC was considered "premature."

Supervisor's Progress Report on the first work assignment noted:

> (R) needs assistance in developing office presence--includ(ing) clarity of speech. Could use training in working faster, particularly with filing. I believe her business math should also be emphasized. During her next work period we can put her to use also if she improves her typing skills.
>
> With the suggested areas of improvement, I believe she could be a very fine employee.

R was re-tested in April, 1967 (about four months after her first testing), her reading grade level was about the same (11.1), but her math grade level had improved to 9.5 and she placed in the 94th percentile in the General Clerical test.

When she terminated from the NYC, R had had 225 hours of classroom work at the Education Center and 300 hours of work experience in the co-op firm. R's NYC/Co-Op experience included five hours of individual, and six hours of group, counseling. At the time of termination, counselor rated R's Overall Improvement in Employability at "4," and commented:

> (R) was finally convinced that she could and should aspire to a good job due to her own capabilities. This was borne out by her early employment.

Follow-Up Information

As a subject in the Co-Op study, R completed a Self-Report Follow-Up form in May, 1968 (about a year after she left the program). As a subject in the Prospective study, R was interviewed in July, 1968, and again in August, 1969. Her employer in the second interview--the same firm in which she had had her Co-Op work experience and to which she had terminated from the Co-Op--provided an evaluation of R's performance (EWP).

Self-Report

R's Self-Report form was amply responsive and included two pages of comments. R gave the Co-Op program highest ratings of "5" in helpfulness of supervisor, helpfulness of counselors, and overall usefulness. R circled each usefulness option and described the most useful part of her Co-Op experience as "learning to work with people, managing my money, and learning to do my best work." R disliked "the fact that some of the girls seemed to be happy with the fact that they were getting money for learning even though they were not actually learning anything." R thought a person might want to get in the Co-Op because:

> Besides the fact that they are getting paid for it, I think a lot of the teenagers today might really be interested in learning a trade and having working experience.

As to what might make a person not want to get into the Co-Op, R wrote:

> I really can't answer this question for I can only see the opportunities and advantages which it offers.

R was earning $1.85 per hour in her job which she described as "Dictaphone Stenographer/Clerk-Typist. In ten years, R thought she would really like to be doing "Pretty much the same thing I am doing now, but maybe I might end up being a private secretary to some one." She rated her chances of achievement as "fairly good"; and, in response to a question concerning anything that might "hold her back," R wrote:

> Well, sometimes in the future I plan on getting married and having a couple of babies and by that time, I wouldn't doubt if they don't have machines to replace me.

R's comments on the program drew attention to practical problems at the Education Center (scheduling, over-crowding) and to the waste involved in keeping girls who were "not interested" in the program when "there are still girls who are waiting to get into the program, I mean really want to get into it and make something of themselves." R concluded:

> I could go on for hours about his matter, but I have to get back to work. My supervisor was kind enough to let me do this on office time, and I don't want to take advantage of him. He has done everything in his power to help me this past year, and I am proud to say that he is very proud of me. He has even sent me to teletype school so that's another experience.

First Interview

R was single, living in mother-only household that included R's child. R had left school in March 1965, because of her pregnancy, and had completed 11 grades. R reported that her child had been born in August, 1965. Household was supported by mother's welfare payments and R's earnings. After leaving school, R took evening classes towards a High School diploma and to improve her clerical skills. R had also been in an MDTA program for six months in 1966.

R had heard about the NYC from friends, and had been in the program for three months, leaving it in May, 1967. She gave the program highest ratings of "5" with respect to liking for work, importance of work, helpfulness of supervisor, helpfulness of counselor, and overall usefulness of program. R thought that the most useful part of her experience had been "learning to get along better with other people," and that "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," "earning money," and "getting job skills" had also been useful aspects of her NYC experience. What R liked best about her NYC experience was that it had "brightened her mind" after she had been out of school. On the other hand, R disliked some parts of the program noting that it was "not very well organized--few teachers--girls coming and going every day." R thought that a person might want to get into the program in order to make money, meet new people of her own age, and learn new trades; and that there was "no reason" why a person might not want to get into the program.

R's description of her current job and of her activities since leaving the NYC were the same as her Self-Report descriptions. In ten years, she would "really like to be doing" the same work or, possibly, be the private secretary to the District Manager. Unless she got married, R felt that nothing would hold her back. Interviewer rated her changes of 10-year goal achievement as "fairly good," and commented, "(R) is very well-mannered and sounds determined." Interviewer rated R at "5" (highest) in all impression areas.

Second Interview

Family situation was the same as that reported in earlier information. In this interview, R reported that she had dropped out of school in March, 1965, because of pregnancy, but had returned to full-time school the following year when she had completed the 11th grade. Additional work in part-time school towards a High School diploma was again noted, but no report was made of MDTA training.

R's descriptions relating to her NYC experience were substantially the same as those she provided in her first interview. R was still in the job to which she had gone from the Co-Op and was now making $2.25 per hour. Her 10-year occupational goal was "Private Secretary" and she rated her chances of achievement as "fairly good." She could think of nothing that would hold her back. Her interviewer rated her chances as "very good" because "R has worked over two years on her present job and likes her work." Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" in all impression areas.

EWP

R's employer rated her overall performance at "5" (outstanding), both on the EWP completed in July, 1968, in connection with the Co-Op study and on the EWP completed in November, 1969, in connection with the Prospective study. R's hourly rate of pay had increased from $1.73 per hour to $2.24 per hour in the time elapsed between the two EWP's.

Case 3 was in the NYC for six months. His occupational goal was "Mechanic" and he terminated from the NYC to enroll in an MDTA course in Auto Mechanics. The work training inputs of NYC experience (Cook's Aide) were minimal in this case; but the program's help in enabling this enrollee to benefit from opportunities available to him proved to be of value to him in achieving vocational training in his chosen field. While the NYC's role of "opportunity broker" seemed more important in this case than its work training function, the enrollee undoubtedly benefited from the NYC experience itself in terms of gaining general job-holding skills, and in terms of support and encouragement with respect to the achievement of his vocational goal.

Case No. 3 Negro, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

When he applied for NYC enrollment in October, 1966, R's age was 18 years and one month. R was single and lived with both parents in a family of seven persons. R had completed nine school grades, and had been out of school for five months. During the summer he had had a service job that paid $1.00 per hour, but job had ended five weeks previously. R's lifetime occupational goal was "Mechanic."

SRG/NYC 01

R had acquired no vocational skills. He had quit his most recent job. Interviewer thought that his goal of "Mechanic" might be "reasonable" in that R had the "ability," but interviewer felt that R "lacks the drive." Interviewer rated R at "4" in Appearance scales and in Friendliness; at "3" in Halting-Fluent, Unpleasant-Pleasant Voice, and Apathetic-Interested; and at "2" in Awkward-Poised, Mumbles-Speaks Clearly, Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and Timid-Confident.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for a little over six months, from October, 1966, to May, 1967. He was assigned to work as a Cook's Aide in a hospital agency. R was terminated from the NYC to enroll in an MDTA course in Auto Mechanics. In the course of his NYC enrollment, R received 40 hours of counseling--five in connection with the move to the MDTA course. R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated at "3," with most marked improvement being noted in Interpersonal Skills, but with improvement also being reported in Speech, Approach, and Tool Skills.

Follow-Up Information

R's first interview occurred in July, 1968; and his second, in July, 1969. R's employer at the time of his second interview completed an evaluation of R's work performance (EWP) in November, 1969.

First Interview

R was single and living at home. R had completed nine school grades, having left school in June, 1965, primarily because he "lost interest" but also because "some subjects were too difficult." After leaving the NYC in March, 1966, R enrolled in the Technical Institute where he completed a 36-week course in Auto Mechanics.

R said that he had heard about the NYC from "friends," that he had been in the NYC "approximately 10 months," and that he had left the program in March, 1967. R described his NYC job as work "in the __________ Hospital Canteen." R gave highest ratings ("5") to all aspects of his NYC experience. R liked his work "very much," because "I enjoyed working with them for one thing, it increased my knowledge and understanding of working around other people;" R considered his NYC work to be "very important," beacuse "I learned how to operate a business machine--cash register;" R said that he had been "very closely supervised" and that his supervisor had been "very helpful," because "he helped me all he could;" R thought that his fellow-workers had been "very friendly" and that his counselor had been "very helpful." Overall, R thought that his NYC experience had been "very useful" primarily because of "earning money," but also because of "help in getting a job after NYC," "help from supervisor and counselor," "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," and "getting job skills."

About his NYC experience, R liked it because "it would help you in a lot of ways--it taught me how to make a living;" and R "did not dislike anything about it." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC, because "it will find you some place to work;" and as for why a person might not want to get into the NYC, R said, "I don't know that."

At the time of interview, R had a full-time job in a rest home which he described as "taking care of old patients." The job paid $1.25 per hour, and R had found the job by virtue of the fact that the rest home was operated by a friend of his family. R had held this job for the seven months that had elapsed since his completion of the Auto Mechanics course in November, 1967.

In 10 years, R wanted to be working in "Auto Mechanics" and considered his chances of getting this kind of work to be "fairly good." He couldn't think of anything that would "hold him back." Interviewer gave R highest ratings of "5" in Appearance and Attitude impression scales, but ratings of "2" and "3" in Speech impression scales. Interviewer thought that R's chances of goal achievement were "not so good," because "his expression is poor and ungrammaticel." "But," interviewer commented, "he has ambition. I hope he makes it in life."

Second Interview

R was still single and living at home. R reported that he had completed 10 school grades and that he had left school in June, 1966, because he "lost interest."

R reported his 36-week course in Auto Mechanics, and described his NYC work as he had done in his first interview ("__________ Hospital in the Canteen"). In the second interview, however, R reported that he had been in the NYC for 20 months, and that he had left in June, 1968.

R again gave the NYC highest ratings of "5" in all aspects, but his rationales were different from those given in the first interview. The high ratings of liking for NYC work and counselor helpfulness were associated with the help received in getting into the Technical Institute and the importance of the NYC work was associated with money ("it helped me get the money I needed"). Overall, R again rated his NYC experience as "very useful," primarily because of "earning money," but also because of "help from counselor" and "continuing education."

At the time of his second interview, R was working as an Auto Mechanic in a job that he had held for five months. His commissions on this job amounted to a payment rate of $2.62 per hour. He had heard about the job through friends.

R had continued in his rest home job until getting the Auto Mechanic job so that he had been fully employed for the 12 months preceding the second interview.

In 10 years, R wanted to be working as an Auto Mechanic. Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" in all impression scales except Dirty-Clean. In this scale, R was rate "2", and interviewer explained that R "had just gotten off work."

EWP

Employer described R's job as "minor mechanics" and put R's hourly earnings at $2.25. Employer rated R's Overall Performance at "4" (average to good). Employer reported that R had begun present employment in September , 1968, and that he was still employed. At latest report, then, R had been working continuously for 14 months in his chosen occupational field.

Case 4 was also in the NYC for six months, but his experience apparently amounted to little more than a period of employment. This enrollee was comparatively well-educated, and had acquired both vocational preparation and an occupational goal (Tailoring) in school. The counseling component of this enrollee's NYC experience seemed fairly strong; but his work assignments (janitor and Recreation Aide) were not vocationally relevant and may have been a factor in his counseling needs (he couldn't accept "constructive criticism" in his first assignment). This enrollee's NYC experience appeared to have improved his attitudes and social skills, but not to have enhanced his vocational skills. His employability needs were much the same as they had been when he entered the program, but they had become more urgent because he had become a married man with family responsibilities.

This enrollee had been able to maintain a record of fairly full employment since leaving the NYC and he had managed to pass his high school equivalency test. Although, in terms of maintained employment and earnings, this enrollee could be considered a "success", his follow-up interviews indicated dissatisfaction with his adjustments to the world of work. His most recent employer rated his work at "about average" and reported that the subject had quit the job because he was "leaving town." It is possible that this subject has subsequently made more genuinely satisfactory adjustments to the world of work. If so, little of the credit for such an outcome could be assigned to the NYC

It was of interest that this enrollee responded well to his Recreational Aide assignment and that he had persevered and completed the GED. In the light of his subsequent activities, it would seem that this enrollee needed help in finding--and could have benefited from--opportunities that would have enabled him to work into more satisfying employment rather than the emergency employment that he found in the NYC.

Case No. 4 Negro, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

R applied for NYC enrollment in November, 1966, when his age was 17 years and three months. R was single, lived at home with both parents in a household numbering eight persons. He had dropped out of school 12 months previously, after having completed 11 grades, for reasons of "discipline." He had had at least one job (a service job paying $1.45 per hour) since leaving school, but had not worked for the past five months. R's lifetime occupational goal was "Tailoring."

SRG/NYC 01

R considered that he had had no occupational preparation, but that he was able to do restaurant and stock boy work. He had been fired from most recent job which he had found through advertisements.

R had had three years of tailoring in school. He thought his chances of achieving his occupational goal in tailoring were "reasonably good," and his interviewer considered the goal "reasonable in view of his training and dexterity and interest." Interviewer rated R "5" in Cleanliness and Neatness, "4" in Posture, Healthy Appearance, Poise, and Interest. R was rate "2" on the Halting-Fluent Speech scale, and "3" in other areas of Speech and Attitude.

NYC Experience

R enrolled in the NYC in December, 1966, about two weeks after he had applied. He was in the NYC for six months and had two work assignments.

R's first assignment was to maintenance work at the University (cleaning classrooms and landscaping). He was in this assignment for about two months, and his supervisor rated his overall performance at "4" (average to good). R received high ratings ("4" or "5") in all performance areas except in Attitude toward Authority which was rated "2". Counselor considered that R had gained "good work habits" in this assignment, but that he had also "demonstrated an inability to accept constructive criticism."

R's second assignment was to Program Aide work at a Y where he was a leader in the recreational room. Again, R's supervisor rated his performance at "4"; and, again, R received high rating ("4" or "5") in all performance areas. Supervisor commented, "This youth progressed, and developed his own permanent job."

In addition to his work experience, R received 15 hours of individual counseling, and five hours of group counseling. Counseling sources included NYC, the Employment Service, and work station. At the time of termination, it was noted that R had been "receptive to counseling" and that his NYC experience had "taught him to work with other youths, develop leadership, and responsibility." His overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great), with improvements being noted in the areas of Appearance, Speech, Approach, Arithmetic, and Writing Skills. R left the NYC to take a job with the City.

Follow-Up Information

R's first interview was completed in August, 1968, and his second, in November, 1969. His most recent employer, identified in the second interview, completed and returned an evaluation of this enrollee's work performance (EWP).

First Interview

R had gotten married while he was in the NYC, and at the time of his first interview he was the head of his own household--his wife and 10-month old child. R said that he had completed 11 school grades, and had left school in June, 1965, because he had "lost interest." He had had no further schooling, and his draft classification was 3A.

R said that he "didn't know" how he had heard of the NYC, but that he had been in the program for six months, where he had worked as a "janitor." Later in the interview, R also referred to his job at the "Y." R reported leaving the program in June, 1967.

With the exception of friendliness of fellow workers, which R rated "5" (very friendly), R gave his NYC experience fairly low ratings. His liking for NYC work was rated "3" ("not enough money"); the importance of his NYC work was rated "2" ("how important can custodial work be?"); the helpfulness of his counselor as well as the overall usefulness of his NYC experience were rated "1" (not at all).

In response to the question, What did you like best about your NYC experience?, R said, "The work at the YMCA was okay, but not enough money for it." R said that there was "nothing" he disliked about his NYC experience, and that he "didn't know" what might make a person want to get into the NYC. A person might not want to get into the NYC because of "the money."

At the time of interview, R had a full-time job as a truck driver and laborer with a milling machine company. The job paid $2.30 per hour and involved, on the average, 53 hours a week. He had held this job for 13 months. After leaving the NYC, R reported that he had spent one month (July, 1967) "not employed and not looking for work." He had spent the first half of August, 1967, looking for work, had found his current job through friends.

In ten years, R "didn't know" what he would really like to be doing except that it would be "something different" from what he was doing at the time of interview.

Interviewer rated R at "1" in Apathetic-Interested, "2" in Hostile-Friendly, and "3" in Timid-Confident. He also rated R at "3" in all speech areas and in Awkward-Poised. So far as appearance went, however, R made a fairly good impression on the interviewer who rated him "4" in all the remaining appearance areas.

Second Interview

At this time (November, 1969), R and his family--which now included a second child born two weeks previously--were living with his parents and an adult sister. R said that he had completed 11 school grades when he dropped out of school in December, 1966, because he was "suspended" and also because he "lost interest." R had enrolled in evening classes (two nights a week for 10 weeks) in October, 1968, and had received his GED, or high school equivalency certificate. His draft classification was reported to be 1Y.

R said that he had heard about the NYC through "ads or announcements" and that he had been in the program six months in 1967, and that he had done janitor work at the University and had been a physical education helper at the Y.

In this interview, R rated his liking for NYC work at "4" ("liked work with the children in the YMCA program"), and he also rated the importance of his work at "4" ("felt I was being helpful"). R rated the helpfulness of his supervisor at "4" ("gave straight answers to questions"); but, he rated the helpfulness of his counselor at "2" ("talked, but didn't do anything for me"). All things considered, he rated the usefulness of his NYC experience at "3" although he had found none of his experiences in the NYC useful.

What R liked best about the NYC was the money he earned, and he had "no complaints" about the program. He had "no opinion" as to what might make a person want to get in the NYC, and said that the program "helps earn money but little else."

R was employed full-time at the time of interview, working for a sausage company at $2.37 per hour. He had left his job with the milling machine company after 25 months, and had found his new job without interruption to his employment. He said that he had found the sausage company job by going "to place of employment" and asking about a job.

R didn't know what he really wanted to be doing in ten years-- he "just wants to be working."

Interviewer rated R at "2" in Mumbles-Speaks Clearly, Hostile-Friendly, and Apathetic-Interested; and at "3" in all other areas except dress which was rated "4". Interview was conducted around noon on a Wednesday, and interviewer noted that R "had just arisen and was sleepy at first." Interviewer also noted that R was "somewhat hostile" at first, "stating that he had been interviewed three times this year on this subject."

EWP

R's most recent employer reported that R had earned $2.25 per hour and that his work had been "about average." His performance was rated "4" in Punctuality, Attitude towards Work, Speed of Learning, and Appearance; and "3" in all other areas. R was reported to have left this job at the end of August, 1969, after having worked only 25 days. R had "quit," said he was "leaving town."

Case 5 had an occupational goal (Secretary) that was entirely beyond her qualifications (9th grade education). She had two work assignments in the course of her seven-month NYC enrollment (Laundry Aide and Cook's Aide) and terminated from the program to take care of her family (she was married and had two children). She subsequently secured employment as a kitchen worker in a hospital which she found satisfactory and in which her supervisor rated her performance as "outstanding." Although the NYC had not been directly instrumental in securing this job, the enrollee considered that her NYC experience had been useful in learning job-holding behaviors. In addition to her work experience, this enrollee's NYC experience had included remedial education and counseling; and it seems reasonable to attribute part of this enrollee's enhanced employability to her NYC experience. (Before her NYC experience, the best job that this enrollee had held had been in agriculture at $1.35 per hour; and, at latest report, this enrollee was earning $1.80 per hour and being considered for supervisory work.)

This enrollee's lifetime goal had changed from "Secretary" to "Nursing." The latter goal might well be within her reach, although her family responsibilities might interfere in this training. The change in occupational goal was illustrative of similar changes, recurrent in the records of the Prospective study, indicating that intial goals might be transitory, changing from identifications of generally desirable work to specific work descriptions often apparently related to the subjects' experiences. The substitution of more realistic goals for nominal initial goals often seemed to be associated with good adjustments to the world of work even though, as in this case, the substitute goal might be distant.

Case No. 5 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

At the time she applied for NYC enrollment in September, 1966, R's age was 20 years and five months. R was married and had two children. R had completed nine school grades and had been out of school for four years. Her most recent job, which had been in agriculture and had paid $1.35 per hour, had ended four months previously. R's lifetime occupational goal was "Secretary".

SRG/NYC 01

R had no vocational skills. R had heard about most recent job through "relatives" and she no longer had this job because she had "quit". Interviewer rated R at "2" in all Speech scales and in Unhealthy-Healthy Appearance, Awkward-Poised, and Timid-Confident. Interviewer rated R at "3" in all other impression scales. Interviewer thought that R's occupational goal of "Secretary" was "unrealistically high," but commented, "Rather pleasant, polite. Appearance pretty good."

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for about seven months, from September, 1966, to January, 1967. She was assigned to work in the VA hospital, first as a Laundry Aide (three months) and then as a Cook's Aide (four months). Her supervisor rated her performance at "4" (average to good) in both assignments. In addition to R's work experience, R was assigned to six hours per week of remedial education in an NYC educational facility; and R received about one hour per week of counseling. R terminated from the NYC in order to "care for family".

Follow-Up Information

R was interviewed in July, 1968, and, again in July, 1969. Her current employer at the time of the second interview provided an evaluation of her work in December, 1969.

First Interview

R was living with her husband and their three children. The children had been born in November, 1964; June, 1966, and June, 1967. R had left school in the 10th grade in May, 1962, because "I got tired of going." Except for NYC classes, R had had no further education.

R had heard about the NYC from the Public Employment Service, and said that she had been in the NYC for seven months, leaving it in January, 1967. She described her work as "pressing shirts, uniforms, pants, and caps in the VA Hospital laundry."

In rating and describing the various parts of her NYC experience, R gave a highest rating ("5") to the importance of her work, because "we were helping out the hospital for the people who need clean clothes." R rated the helpfulness of her work supervisor at "4", explaining, "Most times if I am doing something wrong, he corrects me and when I get it correct he said I did fine." R rated her liking for NYC work at "3", commenting, "It was OK but I had a lot of moving around on my feet . . . and it was hot on my job." R rated the friendliness of her fellow-workers at "2" and the helpfulness of her counselor at "1" (not at all"). All things considered, she rated the usefulness of her NYC experience at "2", principally because of the usefulness of "learning good work habits."

In response to the question concerning what she liked best about her NYC experience, R said, "Worked five hours a day and I liked that, and made $1.15 an hour just as full-time person do, and I like that." R disliked "nothing" about her NYC experience. R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because "like going to school at night gives opportunity to earn money, to be something, and finish school rather than (be) out in the street." As to what might make a person not want to be in the NYC, R said, "Nothing that I know of. I have heard a lot of them say they don't want to go to school at night."

After leaving the NYC, R was a full-time housewife until March, 1968 (her third child was born in this period). At this time she secured a full-time job at the University Hospital. R described her work as putting "food on trays" and reported that she was paid $1.45 per hour. R got this job by "walking in and asking" ("I heard people talking about it, so I went on in and put in an application.") R had held this job for five months at the time of interview.

In 10 years, R wanted to be working as a practical nurse. R wanted to take up nursing, and she considered her chances of accomplishing this goal as "very good." There was "no reason that I know of" that might hold her back. Interviewer estimated her chances at "fairly good," and commented, "Seems to have ability to pursue and complete course if she really wants to." Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" in all impression scales except Speech--ratings of "3" were given in Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and Dialect-Standard Speech.

Second Interview

Family and education as reported in first interview, the only additional information in this area being that R had married in May, 1964. Length of NYC experience reported as 13 months, but description of work the same as in first interview. Ratings of aspects of NYC experience had increased to "5" in all areas, and rationales of ratings had changed.

R liked her NYC work "very much," because "it helped a lot of dropouts;" R considered her NYC work "very important," because "I was working in the hospital and I knew that the Doctor had to be clean;" R described her work supervisor as "very helpful," because "when I first started he stayed with or near me for two or three days until I learned;" R rated her fellow-workers as "very friendly" and said that her counselor had been "very helpful," because "when I stopped with the NYC he tried to get me to return." All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience had been "very useful." R considered that the principal usefulness of the NYC had been "learning good work habits," but that the program had also been useful in "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," "earning money," and "getting job skills." In this interview, as in the first interview, R reported that the NYC had been of "no help" in getting a job.

As to what she liked best about the NYC, R said "I didn't have long hours" and "it taught me responsibility." R disliked "nothing" about her NYC experience. R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because, "It gives one something to do when too young to get a job on his own, so he won't have to depend on his parents." R could think of "nothing" that might make a person not want to get into the NYC.

At the time of interview, R was still working in the University Hospital, setting up trays. She had, by then, held the job for 15 months and was being paid $1.60 per hour. In this interview, R reported that she had held a laundry job in the winter of 1968--work that she had not reported in her earlier interview.

In 10 years, R wanted to be working in "Nursing." She thought her chances of doing so to be "fairly good," but recognized that "responsibility for children" might hold her back. Interviewer concurred in R's estimate, because "seems to have initiative." Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" in all impression scales except Timid-Confident, which was rated "3".

EWP

Employer's evaluation of R's work, completed in December, 1969, described work as "serves hot food items for sodium-restricted diets on to patient trays along a conveyor belt system--one of the most responsible positions on the belt--(job) also involves some food set-up, paperwork, and cleaning." R had worked for this employer since March, 1968, and was currently being paid at the rate of $1.80 per hour. R's Overall Performance was rated "5" (Outstanding). R's supervisor commented, "We have recongized in (R) potential for supervisory responsibilities and we hope to develop her capabilities in this area."

Case 6 showed how family responsibilities can add to the employability problems of young mothers in that this enrollee's work training and employment were often adversely affected by absenteeism arising from her unsolved babysitting problem. At the time of her second interview, this enrollee's children were four and five years old, and the liability that they represented with respect to attendance was diminished. In addition to her family problems, this enrollee had employability needs arising from deficiencies in academic and vocational preparation and attitudinal and behavioral problems. Although her NYC experience fell short of realizing its full potential, it seemed reasonable to attribute some of this enrollee's change from welfare dependency to self-support to her NYC work experience and counseling.

It was of interest that this enrollee's occupational goal, initially in line with her modest qualifications, had become more ambitious (and, perhaps, unrealistic) at the time of her first follow-up and had then changed to a sort of compromise--more ambitious than her first goal, and more realistic than her second goal. It was also of interest that this enrollee's nursing job paid only $1.45 per hour at the time of her second follow-up and thus did not qualify her for the "success" category in this study. By the time her employer returned a work evaluation for her, however, she was earning $1.54 per hour and was thus, technically, a "success." Even at full employment, this rate of pay placed Case 6 in a very low income bracket.

Case No. 6 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When she applied for NYC enrollment in February, 1967, R's age was 19 years and five months. R was single and had two children, and she was the head of her own three-person, welfare-supported household. R had left school four years previously because of "family problems." R had completed 10 school grades and her lifetime occupational goal was "Nurse Aide."

It is possible that R's goal reflected earlier NYC experience in that she described her most recent job as NYC work. Some of the other documents concerning R also supported this view.

SRG/NYC 01

R's Initial Interview as a subject in the Prospective study occurred on the same day that she applied for NYC enrollment. In this interview, R reported that she had had no occupational preparation, but that she felt able to do "hospital work." R said that she no longer had her most recent job because of the "hours (and) baby-sitting problems." R estimated her chances of goal achievement as "reasonably good" and interviewer considered the goal "reasonable," because R "had experience in this area." Interviewer rated R at "3" on all impression scales.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for seven months, terminating at the end of September, 1967. During this time, she had a single hospital work assignment as Nurse Aide. R's supervisor rated R's performance at "4" (average to good), and R's counselor considered that R had gained nursing skills in the assignment. In addition to her work experience, R had around 11 hours of remedial education at the 11th grade level, and 13 hours of counseling--nine hours in group sessions and four hours in individual sessions. Counseling content was described as including such topics as "job responsibility, family planning, promiscuity, emotions, appearance, and grooming." R was terminated by the program, with two termination conditions being noted: "care of family," and "poor attendance." It was noted:

> Enrollee had problem with absenteesim due to baby sitter difficulty. Lived alone with her two children. Considered a good worker when able to report for work

R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "3", with marked improvement being reported in Responsibility, and some improvement being reported in Approach and Interpersonal Skills.

Follow-Up Information

R's first interview was completed in June, 1968, and her second, in July, 1969. R's employer at the time of her second interview supplied an evaluation of her work performance (EWP) in January, 1970.

First Interview

R was living with her two children (one had been born in August, 1964, and the other, in May, 1965) and their father. R reported that she had dropped out of school in October, 1963, because her "mother (was) too strict—ran away from home." At that time, R had been living in Florida, and she had completed 10 grades. R had been in the site city area for five years at the time of interview and had had no further schooling.

R had heard about the NYC from "friends" and reported that she had been in the program for 16 months, leaving it in May, 1967. R reported three work assignments—the first in clerical work and the last two in hospital work. R gave the NYC highest ratings ("5") in most areas. R liked her work "very much," because, "It was interesting because I thought I wanted to be a nurse's aide, but I can't make enough money," and R considered her work to have been "very important," because, "In (the) hospital, people are sick and need help and you do all you can to help them." R thought that her fellow-workers had been "very friendly," and that her counselor had been "very helpful," because, "When I had a baby sitting problem, she changed my work hours to help me out." In contrast to these high ratings, R rated the helpfulness of her supervisor at "2", explaining, "Whenever a problem came up I had to look for my supervisor." All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience had been "very useful", primarily because of "learning good work habits" but also because of help in getting post-NYC employment and because of "having an interesting job."

What R liked best about her NYC experience was "my counselor was so understanding;" and what R disliked as "the old girls on the job expect you to know everything when you're in training." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because, "very interesting and they can almost get you training for any job you want to do." A person might not want to get into the NYC because, "while in training you get all the dirty jobs."

R was unemployed at the time of interview, her most recent job having ended about a month previously because R "had no baby siter." R described her most recent work as involving "bed baths, passing food trays, water, making beds and taking temperatures" in a nursing home and reported that she had earned $1.25 per hour. In describing her activities since January, 1967, R reported two Nurse's Aide jobs, and it is possible that one of these was her NYC assignment. R reported, in addition to her NYC experience and her Nurse's Aide work, two months "not employed but not looking for work" and one-half month "not employed but looking for work" in the 18-month period.

In 10 years, R really wanted to be doing "IBM" work. She thought that her chances of getting that kind of work were "fairly good," but recognized that she might be "held back" "if I don't get my high school diploma."

Interviewer thought that R's chances were "not so good," explaining:

> She needs first a high school diploma, then IBM training. According to her she had to work as her children's father cannot support them for her to go to school. Without an adequate child care plan she will be unable to hold a job.

Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" on all impression scales except Awkward-Poised, Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and Timid-Confident which were rated "3". Interviewer commented:

> (R) seems quite patient with her children, but almost afraid they'll get into something and "annoy" their father. She interrupted interview numerous times to give them water and take them out of a room she said their father does not allow them in. She was constantly excusing herself to call into the other room to them.

Second Interview

R's family situation was about the same as in the preceding interview, except that her children's father was not mentioned. In her second interview, R said that she had left school in 1963 primarily because she had "lost interest" but also because "I moved out of town." R reported that she had returned to full-time school for the school year '63-64 and had completed 11 grades. It is possible that R's earlier report of dropping out in 1963 signified leaving the Florida school, rather than dropping out of schooling.

R reported that she had heard about the NYC from a "friend in the NYC" and that she had had a single enrollment lasting for six months. She described her NYC work as an aide in a hospital. R again gave the program high ratings in most areas, and counselor-helpfulness again came through as an important part of her NYC experience.

R liked her work "very much," because, "I always had the feeling to help people. I want to go one step higher." R considered her NYC work to be "very important," and she thought that her counselor had been "very helpful," because, "Always go to her whenever I had problems. Talked for me whenever there was confusion with other employees. They were really good." Also, in describing discussions with her counselor, R reported that counselor had "helped with baby-sitting problems. They definitely tried to help." R rated the helpfulness of her supervisor at "4" and explained:

> Some days she had good days and some days she had bad days. Miss __________ I liked, but Mrs. __________ was not helpful. Mrs. __________ felt that 'I got mine, but you got it to get.'

All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience had been "very useful," and R indicated usefulness in all listed areas except "earning money."

In response to the question, "What did you like best about your NYC experience?" R said:

> They were very friendly. Could bring out friendliness if any. Made me feel like I was in a big family. They said that if I can't help you, I know who can.

As to disliked aspects of NYC experience, R said:

> I didn't dislike anything about it. Sometimes they even paid me for holidays and wasn't supposed to pay me.

R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because:

> (It was) very interesting. If a person need and want training--really wanted this training--you can get it somewhere.

As to what might make a person not want to get in the NYC, R said:

> If they don't care, you can't get into it. If a person is narrow-minded he won't get a chance to get in. He might think a person was giving him the run-around.

In the 18-month period beginning in January, 1968, R had had two Nurse's Aide jobs and had been employed for 15 months. R had been "not employed but not looking for work" for three months. R was currently working as a Nurse's Aide in a nursing "inn". She had held this job for 12 months, and was paid at the rate of $1.45 per hour. Her description of her work was "take blood pressure, take temperature, irrigate catheter, pass food trays, feed feeders, do patient care, clean patients." She had heard about the job on the radio, explaining, "Place was on strike and I heard on the radio that they need help."

In 10 years, R wanted to be working as a "RPN." She thought her chances were "fairly good" although she recognized that she might be "held back" by "lack of education, money." Interviewer concurred in R's estimate and noted:

> Her desire . . . States that she is determined (however) her two children with no husband may stand in her way.

Except for a rating of "3" in Awkward-Poised, R was rated "4" or "5" in all impression scales.

EWP

R was still working at the nursing "inn" in January, 1970, when her supervisor completed an evaluation of R's work performance. She was being paid at the rate of $1.54 per hour, and her performance was rated "4" (average to good). Except for Attendance, which was rated "3", R was rated "4" or "5" in all performance areas.

"Successful" Longer Enrollments

The seven cases presented in this section involved enrollees whose NYC enrollments ranged from 13 to 26 months. Like the cases in the preceding section, these were cases of "successful" enrollees--subjects who were working at the time of their second interview, who had held their jobs for at least four months, and who were earning at least $1.50 per hour.

Case 7 had an occupational goal in the clerical field, but she had had only 10 grades of schooling and only one-half year of typing. Had the NYC program in which Case 2 enrolled possessed a clerical skill-training program, it is possible that this enrollee could have advanced toward her clerical occupational goal. Case 7's NYC experience, however, included the components that enabled her to become a Laboratory Technician--work that she found satisfying and in which she gave satisfaction. In this case, in addition to the capacity of the enrollee to benefit from her experience, factors in the successful outcome to NYC experience included counseling, remedial education, the educative capacity of the work station to which the enrollee was assigned, and the employment capacity of the agency of which the work station was a part.

Case 7 was in the NYC for 13 months and had terminated to become a regular employee in the same agency where she had gained her NYC work experience. She had continued to develop in the course of her employment, and had--at latest report--become a Federal Civil Service employee. It seemed likely that the character of her post-NYC employer was--like that of Case 2's employer--conducive to enhanced adjustments to the world of work; and that the good effects of NYC job development are often more extensive than post-NYC placement per se.

Case No. 7 White, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When she applied for NYC enrollment in September, 1966, R's age was 17 years and four months. She was married, had a child, and was living with her husband's parents in a household of nine persons including the three persons in her own family. R had completed 10 grades in school, and had been out of school for nine months. She had had at least one job--semi-skilled work at $1.25 per hour--but had not worked for the past four and one-half months. Her lifetime occupational goal was "Secretary."

SRG/NYC 01

R had had one-half year of typing in school, and two years of Home Economics. She had found her last job through "friends" and had left it because of "ill-health." Interviewer rated R at "2" in the appearance scales of Dirty-Clean, Unkempt-Neat, and Poor-Good Posture; and at "3" in all other impression scales.

Interviewer considered that R's occupational goal of "Secretary" was "reasonable," "if (R) could get education and training and improve appearance a little--seems alert enough." Interviewer commented:

> Pretty girl if neater. Pleasant. Talks well. Lives with husband's family. Husband is electrician apprentice at __________ Electric Company.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for nine months. In this time, R had a single work assignment.

R was assigned to work as a Clerical Aide (filing and general clerical work) in the laboratory of a veterans' hospital. Her supervisor rated her performance at "5" (outstanding).

In addition to her work experience, R put in six hours per week in remedial education (reading, math, and English in an NYC-operated education facility). R received 30 hours of counseling--24 individual and six in group sessions.

R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated at "5" (great), with marked improvement being noted in Appearance, Attitude, and Responsibility and some improvement being noted in Speech and Reading.

R terminated from the NYC in a "planned exit" to permanent employment at the hospital in the laboratory where she had gained her work experience.

Follow-Up Information

R was first interviewed in July, 1968--about 13 months after she had left the NYC. R was interviewed again in July, 1969. At that time, R was still working for the hospital, and her employer returned an evaluation of R's work performance in November, 1969.

First Interview

R was married and living with her husband and two children--one born in August, 1966, and the other born in April, 1968. R had completed 10 school grades, leaving school in December, 1965, because "I got married and decided I didn't want to go back to school." R had had no further education or occupational preparation other than that which she received as a part of her NYC experience.

R had heard about the NYC from "friends," had been in the program for nine months, and had left it in June, 1967.

R described her NYC work as first consisting of secretarial work ("I wrote up sheets, filling in answers for request slips") and later as involving laboratory work ("I ran tests on blood"). In addition to her work experience, R reported remedial education work totaling 144 hours; and R counted her NYC experience as vocational training for work as "Laboratory Technician."

R gave the program highest ratings of "5" in all areas except helpfulness of counselor which she rated "3". R liked her NYC work "very much," because:

> I liked the kind of job I got. I liked the people around me. They were very helpful.

R considered her NYC work to be "very important" because:

> Helping patients. The tests can mean a matter of life and death sometimes.

R reported that her work supervisor had been "very helpful" because, "She taught me everything I knew."

All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience had been "very useful," principally because of the help she received from her work supervisor but also because of the job skills that she had acquired.

What R liked best about the NYC was "the training I got from it. I never tried it before. I'm still learning;" and R disliked "nothing" about her NYC experience, explaining, "Maybe because I am easy to get along with." R thought that a person might want to get in the NYC because:

> You can get jobs in almost anything you want. They have almost all kinds of training programs.

R had been continuously employed at the hospital since leaving the NYC. She described her work as "Laboratory Technician" and reported that she was paid at the rate of $2.25 per hour.

In ten years, R wanted to be working at "what I'm doing now." R went on to say, "I want to continue doing this kind of work, because it is real interesting. I just like it." Interviewer rated R at "5" in all impression scales except for "4's" in Poor-Good Posture, Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and Dialect-Standard Speech.

Second Interview

Family situation and educational background unchanged. NYC experience reported as 12 months, but otherwise, substantially similar reports in first and second interviews. Again, helpfulness of counselor was rated "3"; whereas, all other areas of NYC experience were rated "5" (highest). In this interview, R explained counselor-helpfulness rating with "He didn't take up as much time with workers as he should have." (In the first interview, R had explained counselor-helpfulness rating with "He tried to encourage me to get my education.")

In answer to the question about what R liked best in the NYC, R said, "I guess it was where I worked at and the people I worked with." What R disliked was, "The way people (the youth corps workers) took advantage of it. They were making money yet they didn't want to do anything for it."

At the time of her second interview, R was on maternity leave from her hospital job. Her rate of pay was $2.75 per hour, and she had a Federal Civil Service appointment.

As in her first interview, R's ten-year occupational goal was the "same thing I'm doing." Her interviewer commented, "She seems to like her work and the surroundings in which she works."

EWP

R's supervisor at the hospital rated R's work performance at "5" (outstanding) and commented, "Mrs. __________ + Supervisor = Happiness." Supervisor reported that "at the age of 18, (R became) eligible for Federal employment. Took C.S exam, passed, and hired full-time by Veterans' Administration."

Case 8, also a "success," was an example of effective NYC experience that enabled the enrollee to gain employment that was entirely satisfactory to her. Placement in an NYC agency was an important factor in the achievement of enrollee employability. Case 8's initial professional occupational goal was revised downward in the course of her experience so that enrollee achieved her goal by working in the job for which she had been trained in the NYC. The fact that enrollee's current job would reach its highest level of return in another year, together with the considerations that this enrollee had initially had higher occupational aspirations and had sporadically attempted to increase her education, suggested that this enrollee should and could have been more strongly counseled to improve her educational qualifications.

It was of interest that the impressions made by this enrollee on her interviewers tended to be successively poorer, and that her current employer noted deficiencies in appearance and "self-pride." These circumstances suggested that, notwithstanding the technically successful adjustment of this enrollee to the world of work, the potentials of both the program and of the enrollee had not been realized.

Case No. 8 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When R applied for enrollment in the NYC in January, 1967, R's age was 17 years and eight months. R was single and was living with her sister in a household of six persons that included R's own child. R had completed 10 grades in school, had left school for "economic" reasons, and had been out of school for 10 months. R had never had a job, and her occupational goal was to be a Nursery School Teacher.

SRG/NYC 01

R had grown up and attended school in a small town in Alabama. R had had no vocational training in school, but considered that she was able to do unskilled work "well." The fact that she had never had a job was due to her being in school. R estimated her chances of occuaptional goal achievement as "slight," and interviewer commented on her "lack of ability and potential." Interviewer gave R highest ratings of "5" in all impression scales except Awkward-Poised and Timid-Confident in which R was rated "4".

NYC Experience

About a month after she had applied, R was enrolled in the NYC and assigned to work as a Food Service Trainee in a hospital work station. After seven months in this work, R was assigned to work as a Cook's Helper in another hospital work station. R's second assignment lasted about six months, and she terminated from this assignment to work as a regular employee of the hospital in which she had completed her NYC training.

Supervisor in first assignment rated R's performance at "3" (about average) and noted, "Youth was average trainee. Was transferred to another worksite by NYC counselor."

Supervisor in second assignment rated R's performance at "4" (average to good) and commented, "no problems." Counselor considered that R's second assignment had "created a work record (that enabled her) to get permanent job."

In the 14 months that R was in the NYC, she received 40 hours of individual counseling--14 from the NYC and 26 from her work stations. At the time of termination, R's counselor commented that "Youth was well-adjusted and needed little counseling." The termination was described as a "planned exit to employment," and counselor felt that the NYC had "provided work experience" which led to the worksite's hiring of R as a permanent employee.

Follow-Up Information

R's first interview was completed in July, 1968—three months after she had terminated from the NYC--and her second interview was completed one year later. At this time, she was still working for the hospital to which she had terminated from the NYC, and the hospital supplied an EWP for this enrollee.

First Interview

R was single and living alone. Her child, born in November, 1966, was evidently living elsewhere. R reported that she had completed 10 grades in school in Alabama, but had dropped out of school in May, 1964, because she had moved. She had not returned to full-time school, but had taken 12 hours of work in part-time school towards a High School diploma. This class work was also described as clerical.

R had heard about the NYC from "friends," had been in the program for 14 months, and had left in April, 1968. She described her two work assignments as "helped serve patients, washed dishes, and cleaned up the kitchen," and "cooking and some serving of patients."

R gave highest ratings of "5" to importance of her work ("because it was helping people"), to the helpfulness of her supervisor ("helped you when you needed help"), and to the overall usefulness of her experience. In all other rating areas, R gave rating of "4". The most useful aspect of R's NYC experience had been "help in getting a job after NYC," and other useful aspects included "learning to get along better with other people," "earning money," and "getting job skilld."

R liked best "working with other people and learning work habits;" and, as for dislikes, "I didn't dislike nothing about it." R felt that a person might want to get into the NYC to get "training to get other jobs," and that there was "nothing" about the NYC that might make a person not want to get into it "only they don't pay enough."

R's hospital job paid $1.60 per hour and she described it as "cooking and serve employers and patients once in a while." In ten years, she thought, the work that she would like to be doing was "cooking" and she considered her chances to be "very good." Her interviewer agreed with this estimate, because "she is doing this kind of work at this time." Interviewer rated R "5" in Confidence, and "4" in all other impression scales except Dress and Poise which he rated "3".

Second Interview

R's description of circumstances same as in first interview--single, living alone, self-supporting. R said that she had left school (again, in May, 1964) because "parents wanted me to leave, had to help out my family." Since leaving school, R said that she had put in 24 hours in evening classes towards a High School diploma.

R again gave highest rating "5" to overall usefulness of NYC experience, but, this time, R thought the most useful aspect had been earning money although she also indicated that NYC had been useful in most of the other response areas provided for this item.

In rating aspects of her NYC experience, R gave highest rating "5" to the importance of her NYC work ("sick people . . . had to be fed. Important to get right kind of food") and ratings of "4" to all other aspects (liking for work, closeness of supervision, helpfulness of supervisor, friendliness of fellow-workers, and helpfulness of counselor). About her counselor's helpfulness, she reported:

> If I had a problem, he would help me, and talk to my work supervisor about it. Most of time, (he) got it straightened out.

What R liked best about her NYC experience was "help from counselor in getting a job," and what she didn't like was the pay ("didn't pay enough money"). A person might want to get into the NYC, R thought, because:

> Can get a lot of experience. If you don't like a job, you can talk to counselor and get another one.

"Probably the pay" might make a person not want to get into the NYC.

R still had her hospital job, which now paid $1.76 per hour, and in 10 years she wanted to be doing the same job. Interviewer gave highest ratings of "5" in Dress and Friendliness scales. He gave ratings of "4" in Cleanliness, Posture, Clarity, Fluency and grammatical correctness of speech, and in Confidence. All of the other impression scales produced ratings of "3". Interviewer commented, "appears to be a steady, dependable, mature young woman."

EWP

Employer rated her performance at "4" (average to good) and gave her highest ratings of "5" in Attendance (perfect), Attitude toward Work (outstanding), Quantity of Work (highly productive), Relationship to Other Workers (exceptionally well-accepted), and Attitude toward Authority (cooperative). R was rated "4" in all other performance scales except Appearance in which she was rated "3".

Employer's report which was completed by her supervisor about four months after the second interview, gave R's earning rate as $1.96 per hour and noted that, in another year, R would reach top pay at $2.60 per hour. Supervisor commented:

> (R) has proven to be a good employee. We're still striving to increase her self-pride and to improve her appearance.

Case 9 concerned a young wife and mother, ill-educated but ambitious, who dramatically enhanced her employability in the course of her 14 months in the NYC.. This young woman's initial occupational goal was "Policewoman"--an occupation for which the NYC program was not able to prepare her and for which, in any case, the enrollee lacked the physical qualifications. This enrollee was assigned to clerical work including training in Key Punch. She was successfully involved in remedial education, passing her GED and becoming a tutor in the NYC's educational program. The counseling received by this enrollee was needed (she lost her husband in the course of her enrollment) and appreciated. Under a Work Training in Industry arrangement, this enrollee terminated to employment with a government agency to which she had earlier been assigned as an enrollee. "Success" factors in this case thus included the motivation and industry of the enrollee herself and a full-range NYC program with a capacity to achieve post-NYC placements.

It was of interest that this enrollee's view of her role in the world of work apparently changed in the course of the Prospective study. Not only did her "Policewoman" goal disappear; but, in her first interview, this enrollee indicated that she "really" wanted to be a "housewife." In her second interview, she still was attracted to a role outside the labor market; but "if I must work," she said, she would like to become an NYC counselor. Although nominally well-adjusted to the world of work, this enrollee was thinking about finding more personal satisfactions in her work and also, perhaps, more money. Quite possibly, later interviews would discover this enrollee working in a field capable of giving her more satisfaction.

Case No. 9 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When she applied for enrollment in February, 1967, R was just 17 years old. R was married, had one child, and she and her family made their home with R's mother. R had completed 10 school grades and had been out of school a year, having left school because of pregnancy. R had never had a job and her lifetime occupational goal was "Policewoman."

SRG/NYC 01

R had had no occupational preparation in school, and the main reason that she had never held a job was that she had "hunted, but couldn't find any job." Interviewer considered R's occupational goal to be unrealistic because "(R) is too short to meet the physical requirements." Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" on all impression scales.

R's Job Corps Reading Test indicated that her reading grade level was 8.5.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for approximately 14 months, leaving in April, 1968. R had three work assignments. All of these assignments were to clerical work stations with a government agency. In her last assignment, which lasted about six months, R was a Key Punch Trainee.

Assignment reports for this subject were missing except for a supervisor's report on her second assignment and a counselor's report on her last assignment. Supervisor's report rated R's Overall Performance at "5" (outstanding), and supervisor commented:

> Highly capable but seems to lack confidence in her own ability to relate to people in authority or older people. I would like to see her more familiar with usage of good English and especially oral expression.

Counselor's report gave high ratings ("4" and "5") to work station and noted that "(R) has passed the GED, had good supervisory rating, is conscientious and dependable."

In addition to her work experience, R had 53 hours of remedial education and 57 hours of counseling--45 in group sessions and 12 in individual sessions. Commenting on counseling, it was noted:

> One individual interview discussed changing her baby's name due to a complication following her husband's death. Other topics discussed were how to file income tax returns, grooming, conduct, opportunities, job responsibilities, conditioning, etc.

R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great), with improvement being noted in Appearance, Approach, and Supervisory Skills. When R terminated to a training-related job, it was noted that "completion of standard term of eligibility" was also a condition at the time. It was noted:

> Enrollee appeared self-confident. After passing the GED, she helped tutor in Earn and Learn and helped train new enrollees on her work site. Did a good job and seemed to have the ability to do even better. (R) received the GSA commendation letter for outstanding work. An unusually helpful and co-operative clerk and quick to learn.

Follow-Up Information

R was first interviewed in June, 1968, about two and one-half months after she had left the NYC, and interviewed for the second time in July, 1969. Employer at the time of her second itnerview provided an evaluation of R's work in October, 1969.

First Interview

R was widowed and living with her mother. R reported having had two children--one born in January, 1966, and one born in December, 1966. R reported that she first dropped out of school in June, 1965, after completing nine grades because of pregnancy. She returned to full-time school February-June, 1966, and completed the 10th grade. R had had no further education except that which she got in connection with her enrollment in the NYC.

R had heard about the NYC from "friends" and had been in the program for 13 months, leaving in April, 1968. R described two assignments, both in the same agency, the first as a file clerk, and the second as a Key Punch Trainee.

R liked her NYC work "very much," because, "It helped me to decide what permanent type job I wanted;" she thought that her work was "very important," because, "Key punch operators make filing easier. It's a work saver for file clerks;" R considered her fellow-workers to have been "very friendly" and her counselor to have been "very helpful," the latter because, "She assisted me in finding a job with higher pay. She was also helpful with personal problems." R rated the closeness of her supervision and the helpfulness of her supervisor at "3", explaining, "She wasn't always aware of what was going on and so unable at all times to advise us." All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience had been "very useful," particularly for "continuing education" but also for all the other reasons provided in this interview item except for help from work supervisor.

What R liked best about her NYC experience was "It encouraged me to take and pass the GED exam and get my High School diploma. It really taught me the importance of a high school education." R disliked the fact that "I had too many supervisors, nearly every month my supervisor was changed." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because, "It can make a better person of you. It teaches you to work with others and trains you for a special job." As to what might make a person not want to get into the NYC, R said, "Nothing that I know of."

R had gotten a job at the same agency in which she had gained her work experience as an NYC enrollee. At the time of interview, she had been a Key Punch operator for two and one-half months and was making $2.02 per hour.

In 10 years, the work that R really wanted to be doing was that of "housewife." R commented that, "I cannot do this unless I find a good husband." Interviewer gave R highest ratings of "5" on all impression scales and commented that R was "young, attractive and appears fairly intelligent."

Second Interview

R re-married in May, 1969; and, at the time of her second interview, was living with her husband and children. R described her schooling and NYC experience in substantially the same way as she had in her first interview. In this interview, R described her Earn and Learn experience ("went to school part of the day") which she had not mentioned in her first interview. R's second-interview comments concerning various aspects of her NYC experience also contributed to information concerning this subject.

R liked her NYC work "very much," because "I was learning something and earning money so my husband could finish school;" she thought her NYC work "very important," because, "I was getting files of servicemen so they could get their pensions, medical benefits, etc.;" and she thought her counselor had been "very helpful," because, "In May, 1967, my husband passed. I needed to find out about a lot of things. I could talk to her. She was a lot of help to me." R again rated supervisor helpfulness at "3", this time explaining, "Had four supervisors. Some were helpful. Some weren't." R put the overall usefulness of her NYC experience at "4", and explained, "The last seven months was very useful, but not the first six months. The first six months were helpful, but not as helpful as the last seven months." Again, R indicated that NYC had been useful in all the ways indicated in the interview form and added, "Earning money was second to completing my education."

In answer to the question of what she liked best about the NYC, R said:

> It helped me to understand people, especially white people. I hate white people. It (helped) me get my diploma. It helped me get a job.

As to disliked aspects of her NYC experience, R stated:

> Some of the children, kids in the NYC. The regular employees--they looked down on us. Didn't like sending money through the mail.

R's responses to what might make a person want to get into the NYC and not want to were, apparently, continuations of her likes and dislikes of the program. She said:

> It's a lot of help and understanding people act like they want to help you.

and

> They don't pay enough money. They could raise the pay.

After leaving the NYC in the middle of April, 1968, R spent a month as a trainee in the Work Training in Industry program. She was then hired as a regular employee. R had been continuously employed since leaving the NYC, most of the time as a Key Punch operator, but she had also worked as a "Saleslady" and as a "Telephone Solicitor." At the time of interview, R was a Key Punch operator and was earning $2.60 per hour. Since her current employer indicated (see EWP below) that R had been employed by him since May, 1968, it is possible that the sales jobs were additional to R's key punch work.

In 10 years, the work that R "really wanted to be doing" was "nothing;" but, she stated:

> If I must work, I like to have my own time schedule. I would like to be an NYC counselor, working with NYC kids because I feel that I can help these students.

R thought that her chances were "fairly good" and noted that "education" might hold her back. Interviewer gave R highest ratings ("5") on most impression scales. Interviewer commented that "(R) has a great desire to earn money."

EWP

Employer at time of second interview was also employer at time of first interview and indicated that association with R began in May, 1968. R's work was described as "Key Punch operator--use electrical alphabetical card punch and verifier machine." R's rate of pay was reported to be $4,917 per annum, and her performance was rated "4" (average to good). R received highest ratings ("5") in Relationship with Other Workers and Attitude toward Authority and "4" in all other rated areas of work performance.

Case 10 was a "success" story as far as it went; but--at latest report--the subject was not working in his desired occupational field. Whether the "satisfactory" adjustments to the world of work as defined by stable employment records would ultimately lead to employment that was personally satisfying was a matter to be determined in the future. It was of interest that Case 10's employer rated his performance as "about average"--a rating that was lower than might have been expected on the basis of his NYC performance evaluations. Possibly his lack of interest in a non-goal-related job contributed to his "average" work performance ratings.

Factors in the "success" of Case 10 included his own ambition and verbal ability, his interest in the work to which he was assigned and the interest of work station personnel in him, effective counseling toward additional education, and the capacity of Case 10's work station agency to provide post-NYC employment. Although this enrollee's professional occupational goal may remain beyond his reach, it apparently provided motivation and interest for his NYC work. The NYC appeared to have been somewhat slow in getting this enrollee involved in education--an involvement crucially important to the realization of his occupational goal. It is possible that this involvement might have been quicker had the program possessed its own educative resource. Case 10's recent involvement in an IBM course indicated that he was still in touch with and using opportunities for enhanced employability. Possibly, this latest experience may re-define his career goals.

It was of interest that this enrollee's second-interview perceptions of his NYC experience were somewhat more critical than his first-interview perceptions. The change in his perceptions of the program may have reflected his greater experience in low-level lab work which had de-glamorized his lab experience as an NYC enrollee.

Case 10 White, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

At time of enrollment, age 16, single, living in mother-only household. Left school after completing 7th grade for economic reasons. Had never held job, and occupational goal was Space Scientist or Computer Programmer.

SRG/NYC 01

R had never held a job because he had been "attending school." Interviewer thought that R's occupational goal was "reasonable," because R impressed him as being capable of a "high level of achievement."

Interviewer gave R highest ratings ("5") on Speech and Attitude impression scales, and ratings of "4" on Appearance impression scales with the exceptions of Unkempt-Neat and Poor-Good Posture which were rated "3". Intake interviewer noted, " __________ is an intelligient person, however, he had poor eyesight and family is very poor."

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for 17 months, terminating in August, 1968. He had a single work assignment, "Laboratory Aide" in a hospital, during this period.

R's supervisor described the assignment as "performing simple tests in chemistry lab (and) taking messages from one lab to another." Supervisor rated Overall Performance at "4" (average to good). R's lowest rating in aspects of his work performance was in Appearance ("2"). R was rated "3" in Punctuality, Attendance, Work Habits, and Interest in Fellow-Workers; and he was rated "4" in all other areas. Commenting on the gains that R made in this assignment, counselor wrote:

> Enrollee completely mastered job to which he was assigned. Received encouragement for continuing education.

In addition to his work experience, R received seven hours of individual counseling in the course of his enrollment. Commenting on counseling, counselor wrote, "Very talkative. Exceedingly interested in science. Quite prodigious." No remedial education time was reported. R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great), with improvement being noted in Reading, Arithmetic, and Writing Skills, Responsibility, and Interpersonal Skills.

R terminated from the NYC to "permanent employment" in the agency to which he had been assigned as an enrollee.

Counselor felt that R had gained self-confidence through his NYC experience and noted that "(R) made a point of exposing himself to as many new experience as possible." Counselor commented:

> All this enrollee really needed was an opportunity. He used the best part of his wage to help his mother financially. Several permanent employees at the hospital took personal interest in this boy. One doctor told __________ that if he completed high school that he (the doctor) would finance his way through college. __________ returned to school and is still working toward his diploma.

Follow-Up Information

R was interviewed in August, 1968 (when he was still in the NYC), and again in July, 1969. His employer at the time of the second interview provided an evaluation of R's work performance in November, 1969.

First Interview

R was single, living at home, but considered himself to be primarily supported by his "own earnings" (NYC pay). R said that he had left school in March, 1966, because of "financial problems" and that he had completed eight grades. R had taken four weeks of part-time classes (three hours per day, two days a week) working toward a high school diploma. R said that he had heard about the NYC through "friends" and that he had been in the program 18 months. R described two work assignments, the first as an "orderly" and the second as a "lab assistant."

R liked his NYC work "very much," because, "It's a good program and gives you training in an interesting area of science;" and he thought his work was "very important," because, "It will be beneficial to himself and others." R reported that his counselor had been "very helpful," because, "(He) provided him with necessary education." Interviewer emended, "talked him into going back to school." R rated the helpfulness of his supervisor at "3" and explained, "We don't get along." All things considered, R thought that his NYC experience was "very useful," primarily because of "continuting education" but also for "learning to work for a boss."

About his NYC experience, R liked best "being able to work and to do something (one) is interested in," and he disliked "nothing" about his experience. R thought a person might want to get into the NYC because, "It's a big help--for working experience and it helps you financially," and he could think of "nothing" that might make a person not want to get into the program.

R's career wish was to "go to college and be a physicist" and he thought that his chances of doing so were "very good." Interviewer rated R's chances as "unlikely" and commented, "ambitious. but lacks the education."

Interviewer gave highest rating ("5") to R's Confidence, and ratings of "4" on most other impression scales. In three Appearance impression scales--Dress, Neatness, and Posture--interviewer rated R at "3".

Second Interview

R's family situation was the same as in previous reports. In this interview, R reported that he had left school in October, 1966 (when he would have been just 16) and that he had completed eight grades. R said that he had left because, "didn't have enough money for clothes and other expenses," and added that "Family got in the way, by moving, couldn't take advantage of schooling." (In both interviews, R indicated that he was a life-long resident of the site city but that he had been in his present neighborhood only since 1966.) R reported that he had put in a total of 480 hours in part-time classes since dropping out of school

R's evaluations of his NYC experience were somewhat more critical than they had been in his first interview. He rated his liking for NYC work at "3", explaining, "Didn't fulfill my interest. Didn't show me enough to use mental ability;" and he rated the importance of his work at "3", commenting, "They feel it is important--I don't." R rated the helpfulness of his counselor at "4" because, "Gave me ideas how I could go on with school--ways I never would have tried." R also rated the helpfulness of his supervisor at "4" because, "Could always ask about certain things--like job--I asked all kinds of questions and usually got answers." R rated the overall usefulness of his NYC experience at "4" and indicated that it had been useful primarily for "getting job skills" but also for help from supervisor and counselor, learning good work habits, earning money, continuing education, and getting a job after NYC.

About his NYC experience, R said that he liked best "Money. Experience for a better job later on;" and, as for disliked aspects of the experience, R said, "They've done so much for me, I can't say anything against it." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because:

> Good opportunity for experience. We can all use the money--not a lot--but enough. Work is not too hard.

In response to what might make a person not want to get into the NYC, R said:

> Some people say the salary is not high enough. Some of my friends said I was stupid for working for such low pay.

R had been employed as a Laboratory Assistant for more than 11 months at the hospital where he had gained his work experience. He was earning $1.93 per hour.

In ten years, R wanted to be working as an "Engineer" or "in physics" or in "NASA, maybe." R estimated his chances as "not so good" and indicated that two things might "hold him back:" "getting H.S. diploma," and "money for college." Interviewer concurred in this rating, commenting, "(R) still is a long way from H.S. diploma--goal simply seems too high for R."

Unlike first interviewer who had noted no physical defects, second interviewer reported obvious physical defects in that R was "wearing glasses with extremely thick lenses." Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" on all Speech and Attitude impression scales, and at "2" or "3" on all Appearance impression scales.

EWP

R's supervisor in the hospital laboratory described R's work as: "Makes Xerox copies of laboratory reports, acts as messenger with laboratory results and specimens." R had been working in this job since leaving the NYC, or for 16 months at the time the EWP was completed. R was earning $1.97 per hour and his performance was rated "3" (about average). R's highest rating ("4") was in Speed of Learning. R's lowest ratings ("2") were in Attitude toward Work, Quantity of Work, and Attitude toward Authority. Supervisor commented:

> (R) is going to IBM school every night. After 30 weeks he will be ready for a job in this field.

Case 11 was an example of generalized NYC inputs that were followed by successful employment experience. The NYC work experience involved was not related to the enrollee's initial occupational goal, to the work which he subsequently undertook, nor to the work to which he aspired in later descriptions of his occupational goal. Although this enrollee did well in his NYC work, and although he received a lot of counseling in the 21 months he was in the program, perhaps the most meaningful aspect of this enrollee's NYC experience was the work that he did within the program's remedial education component. This program operated neighborhood remedial education facilities staffed with carefully-selected teachers and tutors. Follow-up information indicated that this enrollee "liked best" the educational part of his NYC experience.

Case 11 initially stated that his occupational goal was "Bricklayer," a choice apparently reflective of his father's occupation, "Brickmason helper." At the time of his first interview, this enrollee was employed as a mill operative but his occupational goal was "IBM office work." At the time of his second interview, this enrollee still held his job and described his goal as

"IBM Computer Operator." He was taking correspondence courses to this end, and his erstwhile employer later reported (enrollee had been laid off after his second interview) that this subject refused an offer of re-employment. These circumstances apparently indicated that this enrollee was strongly committed to bettering his skills. Although his NYC experience had not directly contributed to this purpose, it seems likely that this enrollee's NYC experience had exposed him to ideas of self-improvement that took this form.

Case No. 11 Negro, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

When R applied for NYC enrollment in August, 1966, his age was 18 years and 10 months. R was single and lived in a two-parent family of eight persons. R's father worked as a "Brickmason helper" and his mother was a "Housewife." R had completed seven grades in school when he was "incarcerated." He had been out of school for two and one-half years and had never had a job. His lifetime occupational goal was to be a "Bricklayer."

SRG/NYC 01

Interviewer considered R's goal of "Bricklayer" to be "reasonable," because applicant plans to work as a bricklayer and gradually learn the trade. Interviewer commented:

> (R) was convicted of Grand Larceny and Breaking and Entering into private homes. Served 2½ year sentence, and yet he has a fairly good appearance, is polite, and seems to have a plan and direction to his life. He says he plans to "go straight" hereafter.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for 21 months, assigned to work as a Supply Aide (delivering drugs, linens, and other necessary supplies to the wards) at the hospital. R's work supervisor rated his performance at "4" (average to good).

In addition to his work experience, R was assigned to six hours per week of remedial education classes at an NYC educational facility, and he received approximately three hours per week of scheduled counseling.

At the time of termination, R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "4", with most marked improvement being noted in Responsibility and some improvement being noted in Appearance, Speech, Approach, and Interpersonal Skills. R's termination in June, 1968, was reported as a "planned exit" to employment.

Follow-Up Information

R was first interviewed in August, 1968, when he had been out of the NYC for two months. R's second interview occured in July, 1969. At that time, R reported that he was employed; and his employer was requested to complete an EWP. The EWP was completed in November, 1969.

First Interview

R was single and lived at home in a two-parent family. R had become a father in November, 1967. R reported that he had completed seven grades in school and that he had left school in January, 1964, because he had "lost interest." Except for the remedial education incident to his NYC enrollment, R had had no further education.

R said that he had heard about the NYC from "friends," that he had been in the program for 23 months, and that he had left the NYC in June, 196C. R described his NYC job as:

> Worked in the warehouse at the Veteran Hospital. Checked mail, equipment, food, and stock, and also distributed stock all over the hospital.

R reported that he had also gone to night school while in the NYC and had studied English, Math, and History.

To most areas of his NYC experience, R gave highest ratings of "5". R liked his work "very much," because:

> I was able to get along with everybody. If I didn't understand something, I could ask and they would help me to understand the work.

R considered his NYC work to be "very important," because, "I was helping the patients by carrying the stock to the wards." R rated his supervisor as "very helpful," because, "He showed me the main delivery points, also how to pull stock." All things considered, R thought that his NYC experience had been "very useful," principally because he had "learned to get along better with other people," but also because of the supervisor's help and because of "learning good work habits," "getting job skills," and "continuing education."

R rated the helpfulness of his counselor at "1" (not at all"), explaining:

> I didn't like my counselor. They would take time in giving out checks. I had to go to the main office for my check.

R reported that he "liked going to school best. The teacher that was teaching helped me to stay in the program." R reported that he disliked "the counselor and the supervisor over the counselor." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because, "It gave you thrill of being somebody, you get to work with people of the young crowd." On the other hand, a person might not want into the program because, "You were asked to go to school."

R was employed as a card cleaner at the time of his first interview. He had gotten the job through the Public Employment Service, had held it for the two months since he had been out of the NYC, and was paid $1.75 per hour.

In ten years, R wanted to be doing "IBM office work." He thought that his chances of achieving this goal were "fairly good," although he also thought that the lack of a college education might "hold him back." Interviewer concurred in this estimate, explaining:

> This boy knows (that) without education he cannot get the type job he wanted, so I believe he is going back to school.

Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" in all impression scales.

Second Interview

Family situation and schooling reported to be substantially the same as in first interview, except that reasons for leaving school were reported to be "suspended or expelled" (main reason) and "lost interest" and "didn't have enough money for clothes and other expenses" (additional reasons).

R put his NYC experience at 24 months in this interview, and reported that he had left the program in June, 1967. R described his NYC work as "Junior Warehouse Attendant, delivering drugs (in) Verteran Hospital." As in his first interview, R gave highest ratings of "5" to all aspects of his NYC experience except Counselor-Helpfulness. R's rating rationales, however, were somewhat different in his second interview.

R liked his work "very much," because, "Communication was very good in my department;" R thought his work was "very important," because, "I delivered drugs, and (we) had to be on our toes because drugs were important to patients;" R considered his work supervisor to have been "very helpful," because, "She would show me the main things, all departments, the whole hospital;" and, all things considered, R's NYC experience had been "very useful" principally because of "learning to get along better with other people" but also because of the helpfulness of supervisor, getting job skills, earning money, and continuing education. R rated Counselor-Helpfulness at "1" (not at all), explaining that "She didn't take up much time with us and our problems," and (describing counseling sessions), "Most of the time nothing important was said."

About his NYC experience, R liked best "Going to school (and) the importance of the job (drugs and medicines)"; and R described disliked aspects as "talked too much about hiring and firing. Made mis-use of equipment." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC in order to get a job and continue education, and that a person might not want to get into it, because "might not want to go to school (and) counselors may have nasty attitude."

R was employed at the time of interview with the same firm for which he had been working in the first interview. He had been continuously employed and described his present job as running a "#57 Card Machine" for which he was paid $1.89 per hour.

In ten years, R wanted to be an "IBM Computer Operator" and thought that his chances were "very good," because, "I am taking correspondent courses from LaSalle University." Interviewer concurred in R's estimate and commented:

> (R) is very serious about his correspondence course and works hard, sending in his work ahead of time so he can complete the work and get his certificate.

About the interview, interviewer added:

> This was a friendly interview with a very serious-minded respondent. I believe all answers were accurate.

EWP

R's employer provided an evaluation of his work, dated in November, 1969. Employer described work as "Card Tender" and rated R's performance at "4" (average to good). The EWP indicated that four days after R had been interviewed in July, 1969, R had been laid off because "no work available." R had been offered employment again early in November, but he had "refused."

Case 12 began her NYC experience with the occupational goal of "Secretary." She had had a little typing in school, but she had completed only nine grades, and her chances of achieving her goal were considered to be slight. Case 12's NYC experience included nurse's aide and clerical work together with remedial education and counseling. She terminated from the NYC to a two-week, on-the-job training course with the telephone company where she became a regular employee. Although she was a satisfactory employee, and although she had--at latest report--worked 13 months for this company, this enrollee retained her Secretary goal and was planning to school herself so that she could achieve her goal. The role of the NYC in Case 12's adjustment to the world of work was clear up to the time of last report: without the NYC, it is difficult to see how Case 12 could have qualified for employment that would have been even remotely satisfying to her. It seemed likely that Case 12 might continue to improve her skills to the end that she could get a secretarial job; and that, if so, the NYC would have been an important enabling experience.

In this case, the enrollee was unable to get the vocational preparation that she thought she wanted; the enrollee did not modify her occupational aspirations in response to other work experience; and the program may have been a somewhat inefficient preparation for the world of work. In some respects, Case 12 is reminiscent of Case 2 and raises the question of what would have happened had a clerical skill-training program been available to Case 12.

Case No. 12 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When she applied for NYC enrollment in August, 1966, R's age was 16 years and one month. R was single and lived in a mother-only, welfare-assisted family of nine persons which included R's own child. R had completed nine school grades and had left school seven months earlier for reasons of "health." R had never held a job and her lifetime occupational goal was "Secretary."

SRG/NYC 01

R had never looked for a job, but reported that she had gained some vocational skills in school, such as typing, sewing, and cooking. Interviewer considered R's occupational goal of "Secretary" to be "unrealistically high," because R "lacks education and skills; rather poor appearance." Interviewer rated R at "2" in the impression scales of Dress, Neatness, Posture, Grammatical Speech, Voice, and Timidity; and at "3" in all other impression scales. Interviewer commented:

> Boyfriend came into office with her. She has several sisters who also have illegitimate children and only income is mother's domestic work.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for 26 months, most of which were spent at a hospital work site. Her first assignment was as Nurse's Aide. She later transferred to work as a Clerical Aide at the hospital; and, at the end of her enrollment, R was a Clerical Aide in the NYC office.

In December, 1967, interim reports on this enrollee were made. Her hospital work supervisor rated R's overall performance at "3" (about average), and rated R "4" or "5" in all areas of performance. R's counselor noted that R was "still in the program, and is making excellent progress." At this time, after about 16 months in the NYC, R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great). In addition to the 25 hours per week which R averaged in work experience, R was attending classes for six hours a week at the local high school, and was receiving counseling amounting to, on the average, a little less than two hours a week. Counselor commented, "Very bright individual. Responds very well to counseling," and "One of NYC's brightest enrollees, and most improved.

Later program information was missing from R's record. From R's reports, however, it would seem that R's assignment in the hsopital was changed to clerical work sometime in the second year of her enrollment, and that R transferred from this assignment to clerical work in the NYC office. Although standard evaluations of R's later NYC experience were not available, her experiences indicated that her employability had continued to improve.

Follow-Up Information

R was first interviewed in August, 1968, when she was still in the NYC; and was interviewed a second time in June, 1969, when she had been out of the program for eight and one-half months. Her employer at this time supplied evaluation information concerning her work performance.

First Interview

R reported that she was single, lived at home in a mother-only family, and that she had a child, born in June, 1966. R had left school in February, 1966, because she was pregnant, and had completed nine school grades. R considered herself to be primarily supported by her own earnings (that is, her NYC pay).

R reported that she had undertaken part-time classes, working towards a High School diploma, and that she had put in a total of 18 weeks (or 90 hours) of class time. She was still in the NYC , which she had heard about through "friends," having been in the program for two years. R described two work assignments--one as a nurse's aide, and one as a clerk-typist. R gave the NYC highest ratings of "5" in all aspects of her experience. She liked her work "very much," because:

> I had planned on being a nurse or secretary when I got out of school, so I am getting the training in NYC.

She thought that her work was "very important," because:

> I feel that the work I am doing will help a lot of people. I come in contact with the patients. Just talking with them helps a lot.

R thought that her supervisor was "very helpful," because:

> The supervisor is in the office with me all the time. She helps me with the time sheets.

R thought that her counselor was "very helpful," because:

> He is the type of person that you can talk to. He will help me with my problems if I have any.

All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience was "very useful," principally because she was "learning to get along better with people," but also because of the help R got from supervisor and counselor, and because of learning good work habits, gaining job skills, and continuing education.

R liked best about the NYC the fact that "it is giving me experience in work I would like to be doing later on in life," and R could think of "nothing" that she disliked about the program. R thought a person might want to get into the NYC because, "If you can't attend school during the day, you can at night (and) also get to work during the day."

R wanted to be working as a "Secretary" in 10 years, and considered her chances of doing so to be "very good," because, "I know how to type and I am planning on going to Business School." Interviewer concurred in R's estimate and gave her highest ratings of "5" in all impression scales.

Second Interview

R was still living at home, and the information that she gave concerning her personal situation and education was substantially the same as the comparable information that R had given in her first interview.

R had left the NYC in October, 1968, after having been in the program for 26 months. R described her NYC work as "secretary for volunteer service at the __________ hospital and in the NYC office." R again gave highest ratings of "5" to her liking for NYC work ("it helped me in everything--job training, etc."); to the importance of her NYC work, ("I liked what I was doing--being secretary for volunteer service was important to the people I worked for at __________ hospital. I was needed by patients and staff"); to the helpfulness of her supervisor, ("would explain any work that R did not understand"); and to the overall usefulness of ther NYC experience. R thought that the most useful aspect of her NYC experience had been "learning good work habits," but she also noted the usefulness of "help in getting a job after NYC," "learning to get along better with other people," and "continuing education."

R liked best about the NYC the "job that I had. Always wanted the job of secretary. Helping others." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because, "In the NYC, you have a chance to finish your education." R thought that a person might not want to get in the program because, "A lazy person might have to do something."

When R left the NYC, she entered a two-week, on-the-job training course provided by the telephone company. She became a regular employee of the company and, at the time of interview, was a long-distance operator paid at the rate of $1.76 per hour. R's NYC counselor had arranged the interviews that led to this job.

In ten years, R wanted to be working as an "Executive Secretary," and she thought that her chances of achieving this goal were "fairly good." R's interviewer concurred in this estimate, and commented:

> Very friendly and out-going person. Has come a long way in two years.

Interviewer gave highest ratings of "5" in most impression scales. In Dress scale, R was rated "2" because in housecoat and curlers at the time. Interviewer commented:

> This being my first interview, things were a little slow at first. Because of . . . her attitude and friendliness, we completed accurately this interview. It seems that both parties benefited by the interview.

EWP

Employer reported that R still had her job in November, 1969, nearly five months after the date of the second interview. R thus had been working for the telephone company nearly 13 months. R's supervisor described the job as "toll operator--works on a long distance switchboard," and reported her rate of pay as $1.79 per hour. R's overall performance was rated "3" (about average). R was rated highest ("5") in Attitude toward Authority (cooperative) and Appearance (neat, well-groomed). Next-highest ratings ("4") were given in Attitude toward Work and Speed of Learning; and R was rated "3" in all of the other performance scales.

Case 13 had two NYC enrollments--each consisting of one work assignment--and was in the program for 14 months. This enrollee performed much better in her second enrollment; and, on the strength of this performance, she was "promoted" to an industry-training slot. She did well in this work, also, and went on to become an "outstanding" employee in the firm in which she had gained her training. The success of this enrollee reflected the fact of re-enrollment, and the program's capacity to provide a different work experience when it became apparent that this enrollee was not satisfied with her first assignment.

Case No. 13 Negro, Female

Initial Information

NYC 16

When R applied for NYC enrollment in February, 1967, her age was 19 years and five months. R was married and lived with both parents in a household of nine persons that included R's own two children. R had left school 28 months previously, after having completed 11 grades, because of pregnancy. In her most recent job--service work that had ended three months previously--R had earned $1.25 per hour. R's lifetime occupational goal was "Housewife."

SRG/NYC 01

R no longer had her most recent job, because the "job ended." R felt that she was able to do a "fair" job of "filing." Interviewer rated R at "4" in Cleanliness and Neatness, and at "2" in Clarity of Speech and Confidence. Interviewer rated R at "3" in all other impression scales.

NYC Experience

R had two enrollments. The first lasted two months and was terminated by the enrollee who left the program in order to care for her family. R reenrolled two months later. This time R was in the NYC for 12 months and terminated to a Work Training in Industry program. In both enrollments, R had a single assignment.

First Enrollment

R was assigned to work as a Clerical Aide in a Neighborhood Center. Her supervisor rated her performance at "4" (average to good). In addition to work experience, R received seven hours of counseling--four in individual sessions and three in group sessions. Individual counseling was described as including "such topics as NYC organization, chain of command, and importance of education," while group counseling involved discussions of job performance and preparation for work. R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "4", with most marked improvement being noted in Interpersonal Skills and Appearance, and some improvement also being noted in Approach and Responsibility. Termination form carried notation:

> Enrollee requested a transfer to another work site because there was not enough work to keep her busy. Terminated to take care of her (ill) grandmother.

Second Enrollment

R was assigned to work as a Laboratory Aide in a hospital work site. Her supervisor rated R's performance at "5" (outstanding) and commented:

> Enrollee did an exceptionally good job in this assignment. This assignment will lead to advanced training for the enrollee.

In her second enrollment, R was assigned six hours of remedial education per week in the program's Earn and Learn operation and R put in a total of 180 hours in this activity. R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great), with some improvement being noted in Appearance, Speech, Approach, Arithmetic, Writing, and Responsibility. R was sent to further work training in a program run by a nationally-known company.

Follow-Up Information

R's first interview occurred in June, 1968, and her second, in August, 1969. Her employer at the time of the second interview—the company in which she had taken her post-NYC training--evaluated R's performance in a form dated October 31, 1969.

First Interview

R's household was composed of her immediate family--her husband and two children. One of her children had been born in March, 1965, and the other, in January, 1966. R had left school in September, 1964, because of pregnancy, and she had completed 11 grades in school. Except for the remedial education acquired in the NYC, R had had no further schooling.

R reported that she had been in the NYC for 16 months, terminating from it in June, 1968 (about a week before her interview). R described two work assignments, the earliest as "librarian" and the most recent as "laboratory technical helper at City Hospital." R said that she had heard about the NYC from "friends."

R gave the program highest ratings ("5") in all aspects of NYC experience touched on in the interview. R liked her work "very much," because, "It helped me to learn quite a bit about different kinds of jobs;" R considered her work to be very important," because, "I was helping people who needed help;" R felt that she had been "very closely supervised" and that her supervisor had been "very helpful," because, "She didn't get upset when I made mistakes, she helped a lot;" R thought that her fellow-workers had been "very friendly" and that her counselor had been "very helpful," because, "She helped us to solve any problems that come up on the job." All things considered, R thought that her NYC experience had been "very useful," principally because of "getting job skills," but also because of "help in getting a job after NYC," "help from supervisor and counselor," "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," "continuing education," " and having an interesting job."

About her NYC experience, R liked it because, "The training will help . . . to get a good job (and) taught me to get along with others," but R reported that she disliked the fact that "some of the other NYC enrollees were unfriendly." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC, because, "This training helps you to get a good job." As for what might make a person not want to get into the NYC, R said, "Not anything that I know of if you want a good job."

R had been in her Work Training in Industry job about a week when she was interviewed. R reported this work as full-time employment, and described it by saying, "I operated a mixer which grinds grain." She was being paid at the rate of $2.85 per hour. R reported that she had gotten this job through the NYC.

In 10 years, the work that R really wanted to be doing was that of a "housewife and mother," but added, " If my husband doesn't get a good job, I might have to continue to work." Interviewer commented.

> She appears determined to stay at home and rear her children and says this is what her husband wants also.

Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" on all impression scales.

Second Interview

Family situation the same as in first interview, with new information as to date of R's marriage (November, 1964). Educational information was also the same except that the total of NYC education was reported for 12 (instead of 36) weeks. In this interview, R put the length of her NYC enrollment at 13 months. R's second-interview ratings of aspects of her NYC experience repeated those of her first interview, except that, in her second interview, R rated the friendliness of fellow-workers at "3" (instead of "5"). R's second-interview rating rationales, however, added some information concerning R's NYC experience.

R's second-interview rationale for her like-work ratings was "Very educational and helped you get a job;" for importance-of-work ratings, "Helping people in the hospital, found out about nursing;" for supervisor-helpfulness rating, "Never argued when I made a mistake. Always helpful;" and for counselor-helpfulness, "If I had a family problem. When I was sick, she talked me into going into the hospital to get an operation." All things considered, in her second as in her first interview, R thought that the NYC had been a "very useful" experience. In R's second interview, R indicated that program had been useful in all of the ways listed in the interview item and R indicated that NYC had been mainly useful as a way to earn money. In her first interview, this was the only option that had not been indicated as useful.

About her NYC experience, R said that she "liked working with other NYC enrollees, liked the job in general, and liked the counselor and work supervisor," and that "There wasn't anything that I didn't like." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC, because, "They are willing to help you (and) you can earn a little." As for why a person might not want to get into the NYC, R said:

> There isn't any reason. If you need help you would want to get into it. If you need help then NYC can help you.

R had been continuously employed by the company to which she had terminated from the NYC. She described her present work as "organic technician in lab." She was earning at the rate of $2.30 per hour.

In ten years, R wanted to be doing the "same kind" of work, that is, Chemical Analysis." Interviewer rated R at "5" on all impression scales and commented, "(R) feels confident and she appears to know where she is going."

EWP

R's employer described her work as "miscellaneous laboratory work--weighs samples (and) assists in analysis work." The pay reported was $2.14 per hour. R's supervisor rated her Overall Performance at "5" (outstanding), and commented:

> Of the hard-core hired . . . (about 18 in the past 24 months) this is the most outstanding. She is unusual in that she does not bring her personal problems to the office.

Case 14, an ostensible NYC "success," might have benefited from better initial diagnosis of his employability needs and from program help that was better-related to his employability needs. This enrollee's NYC experience consisted of a number of maintenance jobs for a total of 16 months, after which he was terminated to a job as a cutter's helper from which he was shortly laid off. Although this enrollee had not gone beyond 8th grade and was "suspected of mental retardation," there was no indication that he had received special counseling or placement consideration that might have led to a more satisfactory first post-NYC employment experience. Later follow-up information showed this enrollee to be functioning satisfactorily as a hospital worker--work that the NYC could very easily have prepared him for. Possibly the facts that this enrollee was white and projected a fairly good impression of Interest and Friendliness influenced what, in retrospect, appeared to be inefficient program response to this enrollee's employability needs.

This enrollee's perceptions of his NYC experience had changed dramatically between his first and second interviews. His cutter's helper job was featured in the first interview and post-NYC job help was considered to be a "most useful" aspect of his experience; whereas, in his second interview, this placement was not reported and the NYC was considered to have been of "no help." While the quality of his experience was, perhaps, better reflected in his earlier appreciations and might thus be considered to have been a generally helpful experience in the world of work-training, this case seemed to show an inefficient use of program resources that could have been avoided by better planning.

Case No. 14 White, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

When he applied for NYC enrollment in February, 1967, R's age was 20 years and seven months. He was single, and lived at home in a two-parent family of six persons. R had left school for "academic" reasons four years previously after having completed eight grades. R's most recent job, which had ended one week previously, was in service work and paid $1.45 per hour. R's lifetime occupational goal was "Mechanic."

SRG/NYC 01

Interviewer considered R's occupational goal to be "unrealistically high" because he had no training. R made a fairly good impression on interviewer who rated R at "4" in five impression scales and at "3" in all the other impression scales. R was rate "3" in all Speech scales, and in the Poor-Good Posture, Unhealthy-Healthy Looking, Awkward-Poised, and Timid-Confident scales. Interviewer observed no physical handicaps.

Job Corps Reading Test results indicated a 4th grade reading level.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for 16 months or until the middle of June, 1968. In the course of his enrollment, R had four or five work assignments--he, himself, described four assignments in his first interview, and program records indicated one other assignment. These assignments involved maintenance work and manual labor in different locations--an Air Force Information Center, the City Street Department, the Jewish Center, and a Government Arsenal.

In addition to his work experience, R had 55 hours of counseling in group sessions. These sessions were described as covering such topics as violence and rioting, personal grooming, income tax procedure, qualities of a good mate, narcotics, and sex before marriage.

At the time of his termination from the NYC, R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great), and improvement was noted in Approach, Responsibility, and Interpersonal Skills. It was noted:

> Enrollee gave a good image of an NYC enrollee at work site. Attendance very good, cooperative, and interested in learning more about his work. Always on time and got along well with others. Suspected of mental retardation.

Follow-Up Information

R was interviewed in June, 1968--about a week after he had left the NYC, and again in July, 1969. His employer at the time of his second interview provided an evaluation of R's work in February, 1970.

First Interview

R was still single and living at home. R reported that he had completed 11 grades in school, and that he had left school in June, 1962, because he was "needed to help at home." He had had no further schooling.

R said that he had heard about the NYC from the Public Employment Service and that he had been in the program for 15 months, leaving it in June, 1968.

R rated his liking for NYC work at "4", because, "(They were) trying to train me;" R considered that his work had been "very important" "for training;" and that his supervisors had been "very helpful," because "sometimes go out of way to help." R rated the helpfulness of his counselors at "4", because "(They were) friendly and helpful." All things considered, R thought that his NYC experience had been "very useful," principally because of its "help in getting a job after NYC" but also because of the help that R received from his counselor. R reported that the NYC had made an appointment for him with his post-NYC employer and that his counselor had taken him there and introduced him to supervisor."

What R liked about the NYC was "meeting other people and learning a skill," and what he disliked was "not enough pay." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC, "(If he) needed job and training."

At the time of interview, R was unemployed and looking for work. R had been in his post-NYC job as cutter's helper for a clothing manufacturer one week when he was "laid off."

R didn't know what kind of work he would really like to be doing in 10 years ("not sure. Hard to say"). Interviewer gave R highest ratings ("5") in neatness and friendliness and ratings of "4" on all except four other impression scales. R was rated "3" in Awkward-Poised, Mumbles-Speaks Clearly, and Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and R was rated "2" in Halting-Fluent. Interviewer commented:

> Limited ability, very hard (for R) to concentrate. He was cooperative, but it was hard for him to express himself.

Second Interview

Still single and still living at home. This time, reported school achievement at eight grades and said that he had left school because he "graduated' (that is, completed elementary school). NYC experience was put at 36 months in this interview, although date of leaving the program remained June, 1968.

Compared to his ratings of NYC experience in his first interview, R's second-interview ratings were dramatically lower. R rated his liking for NYC work at "1' (not at all) and said, "Work was OK but I wanted training;" R rated the importance of his work at "1" (not at all), because, "It was common, everyday work;" R rated the helpfulness of his supervisor at "2", explaining, "I ask about regular job, he said take civil service test;" and R rated his counselor's helpfulness at "1" (not at all), because, "(He) seemed to forget us after leaving until next week." All things considered, R felt that his NYC experience had been 'not at all useful."

What R liked best about the NYC was "having a job and earning money," and what he disliked was "no special training for any special kind of work." R thought that a person might want to get into the NYC because of "the idea of job training" and might *not* want to get into it because "no training for special job."

R reported that the NYC had been of "no help" in getting a job, and his abortive cutter's helper job, reported in the first interview, was not mentioned in the second interview. Instead, R reported that he had spent the entire month of July, 1968, looking for work. In August R found a job through newspaper advertisements with a hospital. He had worked for the hospital continuously since then--12 months at the time of interview. He described his work as "assist nurse in the hospital recovery room" and he reported his rate of pay at $1.91 per hour.

In 10 years, R wanted to be doing "hospital work like I do." Interviewer's ratings in impression scales similar to those in first interview, but second interviewer noted that R was "retarded."

EWP

An evaluation of R's work was provided by the Head Nurse of the Recovery Room. She described R's job as "works as an orderly . . . transports patients on beds and stretchers from Recovery Room to floor and assists nurses with patient care." He had been with the hospital since August, 1968 (nearly 17 months) and was being paid at the rate of $2.00 per hour. R's performance was rated at "4" (average to good).

Not "Successful" and Not "Unsuccessful"

The three cases described below were neither "successful" nor "unsuccessful" in terms of the outcome criteria used in this study. In each case, the subject was male; and in each case, attitudinal factors seemed important to the ultimate outcomes for these young men. Two of the cases involved 16-year-old enrollees and thus were of particular interest as background to NYC-2.

Case 15 was employed at the time of interview, but had been in his job less than four months. These circumstances prevented the categorization of his status as either 'successful" or "unsuccessful." This enrollee had employability needs that stemmed, like those of many other enrollees, from deficiencies in his academic and vocational preparation for, and attitudinal problems with, the world of work. This enrollee was in the NYC for less than a month, and follow-up information showed an employment history of short-term jobs and "vacations' from the labor force. Follow-up information also showed a short Job Corps experience, so that this enrollee's preparational activities up to the age of 20 might be characterized as a succession of opt-outs (from school, from the NYC, from the Job Corps, and from employment). Although low-self-esteem or a rebellious attitude did not apparently characterize this enrollee--he made very good first impressions--his basic employability need seemed to lie in his attitude toward the world of work. This unproductive attitude seemed to involve the rejection of performance as an essential part of job-holding and was illustrated by circumstances surrounding his most recent 10-year occupational goal. This goal, to be a partner in a tile setting company, clearly orginated in his most recent job (tile setter's helper at $1.50 per hour) and the problems that he foresaw (getting a partner, capital, and experience) quickly materialized in that his experience ended after a month and a half.

In this case, the enrollee's real attitudinal problems were hidden by the facade of an agreeable, "socialized" personality. In order to have helped this enrollee, the program would have had to penetrate this facade and to work in the real problem area of unserviceable or "unsocialized" attitudes towards the world of work. In order to achieve progress, probably several enrollments would be necessary. This enrollee's NYC experience was very far from meeting any of his employability needs, and loss of contact with the enrollee prevented any second efforts. The problems of this 16-year old might be expected to recur in NYC-2, a program focussed on 16- and 17-year old dropouts.

Case No. 15 White, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

At the time he applied for NYC enrollment, in September, 1966, R's age was 16 years and six months. R was single, lived at home in a two-parent family of 10. R had completed eight school grades, and had stopped his schooling the preceding June for "academic" reasons. R had never had a job. R's lifetime occupational goal was "Service Station Attendant."

SRG/NYC 01

R had attended school in a small town about 25 miles from the site city, and his family had moved to the site city within six months of R's enrollment in the NYC. R possessed no vocational skills, but interviewer thought that his goal of "Service Station Attendant" was "reasonable," because R was "interested" and his "education (was) adequate for that." Interviewer rated R at "3" in all impression scales except Poor-Good Posture, Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and Timid-Confident which were rated "2". Interviewer commented:

> Very pleasant, clean, polite, shy. Says just couldn't learn in school. Very likeable.

NYC Experience

R was in the program less than a month, terminating in the middle of October, 1966. R worked one day as a Maintenance Aide in a park assignment, and the rest of the time as an Animal Caretaker in an assignment at a zoo work station. R's performance was rated "1" (entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising) in both assignments and R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "1" (none). Termination was on enrollee's initiative, because he "moved from the area."

Follow-Up Information

R could not be located in the first round of Prospective study interviewing, and was interviewed for the first time in July, 1969. At that time, he had a job and his employer was asked to give an evaluation of R's work performance. This evaluation was completed in March, 1970.

First Interview

R was single and living with his aunt and uncle. R said that he had completed eight school grades when he left school in March, 1966. He left primarily because he "didn't like" his teachers and "some subjects were too difficult" but also because he "wasn't learning anything in school." He had had no further schooling. R had been in the Job Corps in March-April, 1967.

R recalled that he had been in the NYC, which he had heard about from "friends" for three months, leaving it in November, 1966. He described his NYC work as "feeding animals and cleaning up."

R gave the NYC highest ratings ("5") in all aspects of his experience. R liked his work "very much," because, "I like to work and I liked the work;" R considered his work to be "very important," because, "I don't know how to put it, but it was important when people came to see;" R thought his supervisor had been "very helpful," because, "Told me what to do and where to go;" R remembered his fellow-workers as being "very friendly" and his counselor as being "very helpful," because, "(He helped) me get the job." All things considered, R thought that his NYC experience had been "very useful," principally because of "learning good work habits," but also because of "help from counselor," "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," "earning money," "getting job skills" and "having an interesting job."

R "liked the work" best about his NYC experience, and he disliked "nothing" about it. He thought a person might want to get into the NYC, because, "(If) he never had a job he could learn to work and be on time." R could think of no reason why a person might not want to get into the NYC.

In the 18-month period covered in this interview, R had had five jobs that amounted to 12 months of full-time and two months of part-time employment. R was currently employed as a helper in a tile company--a job paying $1.70 per hour, which he had heard about through "friends" and which he had held for about three weeks. Prior to this job, R had spent four and one-half months "not working and not looking for work."

In 10 years, R wanted to be working in "tile company" work and thought that his chances were "fairly good," although R went on to say that he might be "held back" because, "(He had) no partner, no money, and no experience." Interviewer concurred in R's estimate of a "fairly good" chance of being in tile work, noting that "R's occupation now is related entirely to what he aspires eventually to achieve." Interviewer rated R at "4" or "5" on all impression scales.

EWP

Employer described R's work as "tile setter's helper" and reported the pay as $1.50 per hour. R had worked for this employer for 1½ months, and had been terminated because he was "undependable." R had been terminated in the middle of October, 1969. R's performance was rated "1" (entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising). R received lowest ratings ("1") in Attendance (very unsatisfactory), Attitude towards Work (not interested), and Relationship with Other Workers (works poorly with others). R's next lowest ratings ("2") were in Quantity of Work and Attitude towards Authority. R received one highest rating ("5")--this was in Punctuality--he was "never late."

Case 16 was in a work-training program at the time of his second-round interview, and thus--in terms of the outcome categories used in this study--neither "successful" nor "unsuccessful". This enrollee was "classically disadvantaged--a dropout with, as it developed, a police record, from a mother-only, welfare-assisted family. He made a good impression on his Initial Interviewer who considered him to be well-motivated and in need of "close, supportive counseling" in view of his background. His initial work assignment to maintenance work was no better and no worse than the assignments of many male enrollees so far as the relevance to his occupational goal of "Mechanic" was concerned. He was summarily terminated from this assignment at the behest of the supervisor and his planned-for re-assignment was never effectuated. The auspicious circumstances orginally present in this enrollment thus were apparently counteracted by a poor organization of the program's resources. Even though this enrollee did not continue in the NYC, his NYC counselor continued to give him some support outside the program. Possibly this enrollee's subsequent involvement in the Job Corps and in another work-training program could be attributed to this counselor's influence.

It was of interest that this enrollee was one of the few who felt that race would stand in the way of their achievement of their 10-year occupational goals. It was also of interest that this perception was reported in the first interview (when he was a busy volunteer with a black activist group) and was replaced with "education" in his second interview. On the other hand, his first interview reflected appreciation of aspects of his NYC experience that were entirely lacking in his second interview. These changes emphasized the role of changing circumstances in the perception of past experience

Like the preceding case, this case seemed to show the necessity of getting an enrollee on a realistic track to acceptable employment and, in this connection, to recognize the real qualifications involved in securing and holding such employment. However sympathetic, counseling that does not reinforce activities to this end is not "supportive."

Case No. 16 Negro, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

When R applied for NYC enrollment in February, 1967, his age was 18 years and eight months. He was single and lived in a mother-only, welfare-assisted family of six persons. He had completed nine school grades and had left school for "economic" reasons. He had been out of school for 11 months, and had had no work since leaving school. His draft classification was 1A.

SRG/NYC 01

R had been in In-School NYC where he considered that he had received occupational preparation for visual aide work. He thought he could do visual aide work "very well," and that he could also perform satisfactorily as a laborer. His last job--evidently In-School NYC--had ended when he dropped out of school. His lifetime occupational goal was "Machinist" and he thought his chances of goal achievement were "reasonably good."

Interviewer also thought R's goal was "reasonable" because his "dexterity is good," and "if reading skills are not required for training." Interviewer gave R high ratings ("5") in Cleanliness, Neatness, Posture, Healthy Appearance, Clarity of Speech, Pleasant Voice, Friendliness, and Interest. Interviewer rated R "3" in Awkward-Poised, Halting-Fluent, Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and Timid Confident. Interviewer commented:

> NYC experience should prove profitable to R. Youth has many problems; mother is an alcoholic (and) "stays on my back all the time"; youth has intense personal need to "be somebody." He needs close, supportive counseling; told this counselor "never had nobody to talk to." Youth has good motivation to work, desires skill training.

NYC Experience

About a month after R applied for NYC enrollment, he was "taken aboard" and assigned to maintenance work (cleaning and waxing floors, washing windows, etc.) in a recreation center. This was his only assignment, and he terminated from it and the NYC at the end of May, after having been in the program about two and one-half months.

R's supervisor rated his performance at "4" (average to good). Supervisor gave highest ratings ("5") to R's Dependability, Degree Liked by Other Employees, Attitude towards Authority, Appearance, and Interest in Fellow-Workers. Supervisor gave next-highest ratings ("4") in all other areas except Punctuality and Attendance which were rated "3".

Counselor considered that R had made few gains in his preparations for employment in this assignment; and that there had been detrimental aspects to his NYC experience in that R was:

> Terminated summarily by worksite—youth was arrested—charges subsequently dropped, but supervisor proceeded with dismissal.

Counselor rated Attention Paid to Training and Cooperation and Support of NYC Program in R's worksite at "2" (next to "none"), and rated all other areas of Supervisory Behavior and Work Station characteristics at "3".

In addition to his work-training experience, R received 1.5 hours of individual counseling in his NYC enrollment. His Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "2" (next to "none"). At the time of termination, R was to re-enter the NYC at another worksite. R re-enrolled at the end of July, but never reported for work.

Follow-Up Information

R was first interviewed in October, 1968, 17 months after he had left the NYC. In his second interview, which occurred in July, 1969, R identified his most recent employer. This employer did not respond to repeated requests to provide the study with an evaluation of R's work performance.

First Interview

R, at this time 20 years and four months old, was living with "friends." He had been married, but was separated from his wife. R said that he had completed nine grades in school, and had left school in October, 1964, principally because "some subjects were too difficult" but also because he had "lost interest." He had had no further schooling. His draft classification was 1Y.

R reported that he had been in the NYC for two months in April and May, 1967, and that while there, he had "planted shrubbery, operated air hammer, painted, done some carpentry, and some janitor work." R rated his liking for NYC work at "3" and commented, "The job they put me on I didn't care for it a lot." R rated the importance of his work at "1" (not at all), because, Not important to me--the guys were just being paid to be out there." He rated both the closeness of his supervision and the helpfulness of his supervisor at "5" (very closely supervised, and very helpful, respectively), and commented:

> If you didn't know how to do something, he'd (the supervisor) take you aside and explain it. He would volunteer information. He was a real nice guy.

He rated the helpfulness of his counselor at "5" also, and explained:

> Like when I first came in the NYC she was very interested in me. She had me meet her husband; said I needed a father image. She helped me in many ways.

All things considered, R thought that his NYC experience had been "very useful," particularly in getting specific job skills but also for the help that he had received from his work supervisor and counselor, for the learning of how to get along better with people, and how to work for a boss, and for earning money.

In answer to the question of what he liked best about the NYC, R said, "I just liked when they tried to help me as a whole;" and what he disliked was, "They didn't have the kind of job that I liked." R thought a person might want to get in the NYC, because of the "opportunity to better your life--you know, learn skills and be a part of society." R thought a person might not want to be in the NYC, because of "lack of job opportunities they have to offer you which you are interested in."

After leaving the NYC, R enrolled in the Job Corps where he stayed one week. R had been in jail prior to enrolling in the NYC, and he also spent three months in jail after his short Job Corps experience. After leaving jail, R became a volunteer worker for a black power group which he said involved lecturing on black power and "I can't discuss the rest." R had been in this work for 13 months at the time of interview. Since the work was "strictly volunteer," R lived on what he could "hustle."

In ten years, R thought he would "really" like to be a "Cameraman in TV or motion pictures," but he thought his chances of goal achievement were "unlikely." When asked what might "hold him back," R said, "Everything--I'm black."

Interviewer also rated his chances of goal achievement as "unlikely," and commented:

> His heart is not in it. He is wrapped up in the black power movement. Has leadership qualities.

Interviewer rated R at "4" in all impression areas except dress and grammar which he rated "3".

Second Interview

R said that he had been married in May, 1968, and that he had become a father in June, 1968. At the time of interview, R was separated from his wife and living alone. R said that he had completed nine grades in school, had left school in March, 1964, principally because he "didn't have enough money for clothes and other expenses," but also because he "wasn't learning anything," and because he "lost interest."

R put his NYC experience at three months and described his work as "working for the city, building parks and playgrounds, and construction work." R rated his liking for NYC work at "1" (not at all), amplifying, "I didn't like it, didn't have any future, no hope for advancement." R also rated the closeness of his supervision at "1" (not at all); and, "all things considered," thought that his NYC experience had been "not at all useful."

What R liked best about the NYC was "the part where I got the money," and what R disliked was "the whole program, poorly run and every damn thing else." R thought there was "nothing" about the program that might make a person want to get into it. A person might not want to get into the NYC because:

> Unqualified people. They say they have the background which they don't. People down there making $10,000 a year and don't know no more than I do.

In the 19 months between January 1, 1968, and the date of the second interview, R reported that he had been unemployed and looking for work for 10 months, had had part-time employment for five months and full-time employment for two months, had been in jail one month and was currently in a CEP program. His most recent job had involved part-time work for a dentist-- two 8-hour days a week at $1.92 per hour. R had left this part-time work for the CEP about a month before the second interview.

R's 10 year occupational goal was still to be a cameraman and he still rated his chances as "unlikely," feeling, this time, that his "education" might hold him back. Interviewer rated his chances of goal achievement as "not so good," and commented:

> Respondent has no understanding of reading. Seems to have a grudge against programs such as these which don't work.

Interviewer rated R at "1" in Ungrammatical-Good Grammar, and at "2" in Mumbles-Speaks Clearly, Halting-Fluent, Heavy Accent-Standard Speech, Hostile-Friendly, and Timid-Confident. Interviewer rated R at "3" in Awkward-Poised and Apathetic-Interested, and at "4" or "5" in remaining appearance areas.

Case 17 apparently illustrated effective NYC experience through the time of his first interview, but his second interview indicated that this enrollee had failed to maintain his satisfactory adjustments to society and to the world of work. This enrollee was assigned to work that was relevant to his occupational goal, he participated in remedial education and counseling, he qualified for skill training, and, ultimately, he was placed as a regular employee in the agency where he had worked as an enrollee. At the time of his first interview, Case 17 had been employed for more than half a year and he could be considered a "success." A year later, however, this enrollee was not working; and, although looking for work, had no ambitions in the world of work. This dramatic change could be attributed to a disastrous foray into the world of easy money. This world, often present in the minds of young men, can handicap efforts to achieve satisfactory adjustments to the world of work.

Case No. 17 Negro, Male

Initial Information

NYC 16

When he applied for NYC enrollment in February, 1967, R's age was 16 years and eight months. R was single and lived at home in a two-parent family of six persons. R had completed nine school grades, and had left school six months previously for reasons of "discipline." R had not had a job since leaving school, and his lifetime occupational goal was "Office Work."

SRG/NYC 01

R had had one-half year of Typing and one-half year of Drafting in school. He felt that he could perform as a "Dishwasher." Interviewer considered R's occupational goal to be "unrealistically high" because R had "no office skills." Interviewer rated R at "2" in Awkward-Poised, Timid-Confident, and all speech impression scales except Unpleasant-Pleasant Voice. R was rated "3" in all other impression scales.

The Job Corps Reading test indicated that R was reading at a 9th grade level.

NYC Experience

R was in the NYC for 14 months, or until April, 1968. R had three or four work assignments in several governmental agencies. His first assignment was two-part--first as a labor trainee and then as a machine operator trainee in a records center--and his last two assignments were to clerical work in two other agencies. A supervisor's report was provided for the first assignment, and a counselor's report was provided for the last assignment.

Supervisor rated R's Overall Performance as a labor-trainee and machine operator trainee at "5" (outstanding) and commented, "(R) is steady and dependable, wants to learn, (is an) excellent to good worker." Counselor reported that R had gained experience as an IBM machine operator in his most recent clerical assignment.

In addition to his work experience, R had 104 hours of remedial education in Reading and Mathematics in the program's Earn and Learn component. R had a total of 59 counseling hours--51 in group sessions and eight in individual sessions. Counseling topics included "drug addiction, NYC and you, Job performance, Earn and Learn classes, Job opportunities, Federal Income Tax forms, How to make the best of opportunities offered, and Everyday living." R's termination from the NYC was a "planned exit" to a "training-related" job in the same agency where he had had his most recent work experience.

R's Overall Improvement in Employability was rated "5" (great) with most marked improvement being reported in Responsibility, but with some improvement also being reported in Approach and Interpersonal Skills. It was commented:

> At first, enrollee had a problem getting back from lunch and breaks at a reasonable time. Enrollee had a pattern of irresponsible behavior (unauthorized use of elevators and scooters) at first, but applied himself diligently to the many tasks assigned him.

Follow-Up Information

R was interviewed in November, 1968, and in August, 1969. His most recent employer, identified in his second interview, provided an evaluation of R's work performance (EWP).

First Interview

R was single and living with his sister. He reported that he had left school in February, 1966, because he had "lost interest" and that he had completed 10 grades. Except for his NYC classes, R had had no further schooling. R's draft classification was 1A.

R said that he had heard about the NYC from "friends," he put his NYC experience at 16 months, and dated his departure from the NYC in July, 1968.

R described three assignments: "filing and helping out with setting up key punch," "two months of labor--placing file cabinets," and "Electronics accountant--keeping track of peoples' time cards."

R rated his liking for NYC work at "3" and explained:

> Some ways the NYC is set up I like, and some I didn't like. I liked the way they tried to guide you, helping us to cope with some of the problems. I didn't like the fact that out of 300 people about 10 were taken on regular in the program Opportunity for Youth.

R gave highest ratings ("5") to other aspects of his NYC experience. R thought that his work was "very important," because, "Classified information for other people;" he thought that his supervisor was "very helpful," because, "(Would) give you two or three chances when you were wrong--would give you a chance to straighten things out;" and he thought that his counselor was "very helpful," because he "gave you all the help he could." All things considered, R thought that his NYC experience had been "very useful," principally because of "getting job skills," but also because of "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," and "earning money."

R "liked all the experience that I got from it (the NYC)" and "I only disliked the fact that there wasn't enough (permanent) work for everyone." R said that a person might want to get into the NYC because of "the fact that you are out of work," and he thought a person might not want to because of "better jobs with better pay."

R had been a full-time employee in the agency were he had worked as an enrollee since leaving the NYC. He described the work as that of an "Electronic accountant" or "punch operator--put out a large number of cards that the key punch can't punch" and reported his pay at the rate of $2.15 per hour.

In 10 years, the work that R really wanted to be doing was "sitting down." Interviewer commented on this facetious response:

> Because he will soon be drafted, he doesn't know what to plan.

Interviewer gave R highest ratings ("5") in all impression scales.

Second Interview

R was still single, still living with his sister (he considered himself to be self-supported by his "savings"), and his draft classfication was still 1A. R reported that he had four children, and gave the birthdate of one. R reported that he had completed 11 school grades, and that he had left school (in February, 1966) primarily because he "lost interest" but also because "some subjects were too difficult."

R put the length of his NYC experience at eight months. In this interview, R gave highest rating ("5") to supervisor helpfulness ("When I messed up cards he tried to help me or didn't fuss at me") and ratings of "4" in all other areas. R's rating rationales were more perfunctory (he liked his work because "it was nice training to get" and he considered it important, because "I just felt it was important"). All things considered, R rated the usefulness of his NYC experience at "4", primarily because of "earning money," but also for all the other options provided in this question. R liked best the "training" and he disliked "low pay;" "Living bad" might make a person want to get into the NYC, and "Living good" might make a person not want to.

R had held his "Electronic Accountant" job until January of 1969 when he was jailed. His rate of pay at that time had been $2.83 per hour. He was in jail for six months and had been "not employed but looking for work" in the month preceding interview.

In 10 years, R said that he wants to be "retired." Interviewer commented that R "appeared serious about this." Interviewer rated R at "2" in Halting-Fluent speech, and at "4" in Appropriate Dress, Friendliness, Interest, and Confidence. In all other impression scales, interviewer rated R at "3". Interviewer (a man) commented:

> R stated that he has four babies which he doesn't give any assistance (to) and it doesn't bother him. Seems unconcerned about life. He stated that his experience in the work house wasn't bad at all, "It was like going to camp."

EWP

R's supervisor described R's work as "worked with IBM EAM Machines sorting, interpreting, collating, and reproducing data." He reported R's pay at $4,600 per annum, and rated R's performance at "4" (average to good). He said that R no longer worked in this job because, "(R) found better paying position in private industry." R's termination from this job was dated December 21, 1968--or about a week before R reported that he began his jail term. R's supervisor commented:

> (R) started out to be an exceptionally good employee. Eventually ended up going around with the wrong group of young people.

APPENDIX L

Abstract ("Highlights"), "Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op"

4 pages

APPENDIX L

HIGHLIGHTS

This paper reports the results of a study of the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op, a formal skill-training program designed to enhance the clerical employability of enrollees in the Cincinnati Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Co-Op program differs from standard NYC work-training programs in that it alternates periods of classroom work in the NYC Education Center with periods of work experience in firms that are potential employers of the enrollees. The Co-Op study was undertakend as a component of research investigating the effectiveness of selected, urban, out-of-school NYC programs.

Beginning in May, 1966, all enrollees entering the Co-Op were placed in the Co-Op study group until a desirable group size of 127 subjects had been reached. Study data included information at the time of enrollment, information reflecting program experience, and follow-up information concerning the employment sequels to Co-Op experience. Follow-up enrollee information was secured from 97 percent of the Co-Op subjects, and from 100 percent of the employers identified in enrollee follow-up.

At the time of their Co-Op enrollment, study subjects averaged 11.1 school grades completed, a reading grade level of 8.4, an arithmetic grade level of 6.8, and they placed, on the average, in the 35th percentile on a test of general clerical skills. Co-Op subjects--all except one of whom were female--did not appear to be different from female NYC enrollees in Cincinnati in general in the matters of schooling, number of children, background of welfare assistance, and recorded police contacts.

The Co-Op featured training cycles composed of classroom and work experience, with cycles being repeated until employability had been achieved.

Work supervisor evaluations guided the emphasis of ensuring classroom work and indicated when an enrollee is ready for regular employment. If an enrollee was not ready at the end of a work period, the supervisor evaluation indicated what skills and behaviors should be improved in the ensuing period of classroom work.

During the period reflected in the Co-Op study, a noteworthy shift occurred in the character of work experience sites. The program began by using regular NYC work sites. As the program developed, however, work experience in the offices of cooperating businesses replaced NYC work sites. Business work experience was deemed to provide more effective and realistic training and possessed the additional advantage of higher placement potential. Co-Op enrollees on assignment to a cooperating business are on the payroll of that firm for the period of the assignment, and many of them become regular employees of the Co-Op firms after completing their Co-Op training.

Follow-up information secured in the summer of 1968 indicated that 86 percent of the Co-Op subjects were in the labor force and that 60 percent of them had post-Co-Op employment at the time of follow-up. When they entered the NYC, all of these subjects were unemployed and 56 percent of them had never held a job lasting 30 days or more. Compared to a Control group, very significantly more of the Co-Op subjects had achieved good adjustments to the world of work.

Employers supplied performance reports for Co-Op subjects with post-Co-Op employment--subjects employed at the time of follow-up, as well as those no longer working in their post-Co-Op jobs. Eighty-one percent of the subjects who held, or had held, jobs were rated as average or above in overall job performance. Only seven percent were rated as "entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising," and 12 percent were rated as "unsatisfactory but showed signs of improvement."

Comparisons of "successful" and "unsuccessful" Co-Op subjects indicated that some of the most important elements of employability are performance (quantity and quality of work), appearance, work attitudes, and social skills. The Co-Op program elements that significantly contributed to enhanced employability were work experience, particularly in business Co-Op work sites, and job referrals. As might be expected, age and school grade completed were also associated with a successful employment outcome.

Co-Op subjects averaged just under seven months in the program. Most had left the program at the time of follow-up, and had been out of the Co-Op 11.5 months, on the average. Looking back on their Co-Op experience, most subjects rated the program as "very useful," giving the greatest weight to work-relevant aspects such as getting job skills, acquiring good work habits, and learning to work for a boss.

The Co-Op study indicated that this formal skill-training program effectively enchanced the clerical employability of NYC enrollees in Cincinnati. The employment effectiveness of this clerical Co-Op suggested that it might serve as a model, with appropriate modifications, in other NYC programs and in other occupational areas. The essential elements of such a model skill-training program are:

1. Selection of job categories for which there are ample employment opportunities, and in which training at a minimal level of competence can be accomplished within six months.

2. Initial training at a Training Center for a period of three to six weeks.

3. On-the-job training for a period of about four weeks, preferably at a work site that provides opportunities for permanent employment.

4. Reassignment to Training Center, concentrating on work deficiencies reported by work supervisor during last work assignment.

5. Provision for remedial education as required.

6. Continuation of the cycle of work experience and formal training until enrollee has been judged ready for employment. Enrollee should be reassigned to a new work site whenever this appears to be necessary.

7. Assistance in obtaining a job after training has been completed.

8. Follow-up counseling until enrollee has made an adequate adjustment to a job.

APPENDIX M

Abstract,
"The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes"

2 pages

APPENDIX M

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the development of a self-report inventory for measuring work-relevant attitudes. A pool of 72 items was created after a review of the research literature. These items were administered to 89 out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees in Cincinnati and to 78 New Careers enrollees in Durham. Performance ratings were obtained from counselors for each subject. A factor analysis of the 72 items produced three interpretable factors: Optimism, Unsocialized Attitudes, and Self-Confidence.

The items were then grouped into three scales designed to measure these variables. An item was included in a scale if its content appeared to be related to the hypothesis for the scale, if it loaded significantly on the relevant factor, and if it differentiated between criterion groups. Scale scores were found to correlate significantly with criterion measures in the predicted direction.

A revised inventory was prepared to be used in further developmental work. Items were added or rewritten to improve the quality of items, and ineffective items were eliminated. The revised inventory included 34 items and took between 10 and 15 minutes to administer.

It was administered to 447 subjects in three out-of-school groups (NYC, New Careers, and delinquents) and four in-school groups (NYC, and students in a suburban high school, an inner-city high school, and a vocational urban high school). The inventory differentiated on the basis of sex, race, and school status with the largest proportion of the variance associated with school status. A factor analysis of the items supported the previous conclusions that Optimism,

Self-Confidence, and Unsocialized Attitudes were three important underlying dimensions.

The 34-item inventory was also used in a longitudinal study of NYC and New Careers enrollees, with the inventory being administered at the time of enrollment and performance ratings being secured six months to a year after enrollment. The results were ambiguous. In general, differences in the predicted direction were found for females but not for males. It was suggested that this result may have been due to the greater effectiveness of the NYC program for females.

Finally, 10 items from the inventory were included in an interview schedule administered to 306 Negro male school dropouts interviewed approximately two and one-half years after dropping out of school. The items were found to differentiate in the predicted direction on the basis of adjustment to the world of work.

The inventory was then revised a second time and reduced to 26 items. It is currently being used in a study of the NYC-2 program in four cities in an effort to validate it in terms of a typology of enrollee employability needs.

It is hoped that, when fully developed and validated, the inventory will prove useful in connection with the development of programs designed to modify work-relevant attitudes. The inventory could be useful in individual diagnosis, in the development of remedial strategies, and in the evaluation of program effectiveness in terms of attitudinal change.